A

DEFENCE

OF THE

Short View

OF THE

Profaneneſs and Immorality

OF THE

Engliſh STAGE, &c.

Being a

REPLY

To Mr. *Congreve*'s Amendments, &c.

And to the

Vindication of the Author of the Relapſe.

By *Jeremy Collier*, M. A.

Fortem animum præſtant rebus quas turpiter audent.

Juven. Sat. 6.

LONDON:

Printed for *S. Keble* at the *Turks-Head* in *Fleet-ſtreet*, and *R. Sare* at *Grays-Inn-gate*. 1705.

HARVARD COLLEGE
MAY 16 1905
LIBRARY

By exchange of duplicates
from Rowe Library.
(Gift John Drew)

To the READER.

SInce the publiſhing my late View, &c. *I have been plentifully rail'd on in Print: This gives me ſome reaſon to ſuſpect the* Anſwerers *and the Cauſe are not altogether unlike. Had there been nothing but plain Argument to encounter, I think I might have ventur'd my Book with them: But being charg'd with miſcitations and unfair Dealing, 'twas requiſite to ſay ſomething: For Honeſty is a tender point, and ought not to be neglected.*

Mr. Congreve *and the Author of the* Relapſe, *being the moſt eager Complainants, and* Principals *in the Diſpute, I have made it my choice to ſatisfie them. As for the* Volunteers, *they will find themſelves affected with the Fortune of their Friends; and beſides, I may probably have an Opportunity of ſpeaking farther with them hereafter.*

Notwithſtanding the ſingular Management of the Poets *and* Play-Houſe, *I have had the ſatisfaction to perceive, the Intereſt of Virtue is not altogether Sunk, but that Conſcience and Modeſty have ſtill ſome Footing among us. This Conſideration makes me hope a little farther Diſcovery of the Stage may not be unacceptable. The* Reader *then may pleaſe to take notice, that the* Plot *and no* Plot

ſwears

ſwears at length, and is ſcandalouſly Smutty and Profane. The Fool in Faſhion *for the firſt four Acts is liable to the ſame Imputation: Something in Swearing abated,* Cæſar Borgia, *and* Love in a Nunnery *: are no better Complexion'd than the former. And laſtly,* Limberham, *and the* Soldier's Fortune, *are meer prodigies of Lewdneſs and Irreligion. If this general Accuſation appears too hard, I am ready to make it good. 'Twere eaſy to proceed to many other* Plays, *but poſſibly this Place may not be ſo proper to enlarge upon the Subject.*

Some of the Stage-Advocates *pretend my Remarks on their Poetry are foreign to the Buſineſs. On the Contrary, I conceive it very defenſible to diſarm an Adverſary, if it may be, and diſable him from doing Miſchief.*

To expoſe that which would expoſe Religion, is a warrantable way of Reprizals. Thoſe who paint for Debauchery, ſhould have the Fucus pull'd off, and the Coarſneſs underneath diſcover'd. The Poets are the Aggreſſors, let them lay down their Arms firſt. We have ſuffer'd under Silence a great while; If we are in any fault, 'tis becauſe we began with them no ſooner.

AN

ANSWER

TO

Mr. *CONGREVE*'s Amendments, &c.

MR. *Congreve* being a Perſon of no great Ceremony, I ſhan't ſalute him with any Introduction; but fall to the Buſineſs without more Ado. This Gentleman pretends to turn ſome of my Expreſſions upon me. *If theſe Paſſages, ſays he, produced by* Mr. *Collier* are *obſcene* and *profane*, 'why 'are they raked in and diſturb'd, unleſs it 'be to conjure up Vice, and revive Impu- 'rities, &c. I can't think Mr. *Congreve* ſo injudicious as to believe this Citation a jot to his purpoſe. But I plainly perceive he Preſumes all along upon the weakneſs, or partiality of his *Reader*: Which by the way, is no great Compli- *Amend.* p. 5.

ment. However, to ſay ſomething directly. Had *theſe* obnoxious *Paſſages* lain hid in a learned Language, and been lock'd up in Latin, like *Juvenal*, I would no more have let them looſe in a *Tranſlation*, than unchain'd the *Tyger* at *Bartholomew Fair*: But ſince the Miſchief works in *Engliſh*, 'tis time to think of an *Engliſh* Remedy. Beſides, as to the Smut, I have endeavour'd not to diſoblige the *Paper* with any of it. But to ſhew the Accuſation juſt, I made a general Reference to *Play*, and *Character*: And ſometimes upon a ſpecial Occaſion; have mark'd the *Page*. Indeed to have tranſcrib'd it at length, would not only have been an improper, but a tedious Employment.

I was ſenſible the *Poets* would try to make their Advantage, of this Neceſſary Reſerv'dneſs, that they would deny the *Fact*, becauſe the Proof was not particular, and ſpoken out. But ſince the *Reader* is directed to the Evidence, he may diſappoint them in this Evaſion, if he pleaſes. The profane Part, tho' Bolder, and more Black, will bear the Light better, and therefore when 'twas clear of Obſcenity, I have ſet it to the *Bar*. Upon the whole; I was willing to Guard the Virtue, and awaken the Caution of the *Reader*: And by the ſafeſt Methods

I could think of, to give check to the Complicated Infection.

He affirms I call the *Stage-Poets*, *Buffoons* and *Slaves*; for this he Quotes 81, 63, and 175 Pages of the *View*, &c. Let us examine his Proof: The place in the 63 *Page* is a Cenſure of a Profane and Smutty Paſſage in the *Old Batchelour*: In which I have ſaid that *Fondlewife*'s making Sport with Adultery, in the manner deſcribed, was a fit of Buffoonry and Profaneneſs. Now to ſay this of a *Character* in the *Play*, is I ſuppoſe pretty Different from calling the *Poet* Buffoon. In the 81 *Page*, after I had produc'd a large Roll of Blaſphemy, and *Scripture*-Abuſe againſt the *Stage*; I thought I had Reaſon to be ſomewhat concern'd; to ſee the Chriſtian Religion thus horribly outraged, *made the Diverſion* of the *Town*, and the *Scorn* of *Buffoons*: I'm miſtaken if this Occaſion would not juſtify a little Severity of Language; And till Mr. *Congreve* can diſprove the Charge, he had much better Repent, than Complain: However there's no neceſſity he ſhould take that Word to himſelf, unleſs he thinks he deſerves it: For it may be applied to the *Actors*, or ſome few *Libertines* in the *Audience*, and then his Objection is ſpoil'd. His *Amend.* p. 6.

3*d*. Inſtance ſtands in *Page* 175*th*. of the *View*, &c. Here upon their unpreſidented Familiarity with the *Lords*; I deſired to know whether our *Stage* had *a particular Privilege? Was their Charter enlarg'd*; and were they on the *ſame Foot of Freedom with the Slaves in* the *Saturnalia?* Here Mr. *Congreve* is poſitive I call the *Poets Slaves*: 'Tis well when his Hand was in; he did not charge me with calling them *Saturnalia*: But which way do I call them *Slaves*? Why becauſe I ſaid, they were very Free. Is Liberty then always faſten'd to a Chain; and Familiarity a proof of Servitude? The Reſemblance in the Queſtion reſpects Behaviour more than Condition, and implies nothing farther than general Inequality. Now I hope 'tis no affront to the *Stage*, to ſuppoſe them inferior to the *Houſe of Lords*. His remaining Inſtance from my *Preface*, is much like this; and requires no farther Anſwer.

Thus Mr. *Congreve* may perceive I have called him no *Names* hitherto; But now he may be aſſured I ſhould have diſtinguiſh'd his Character a little, and paid him ſome proper Acknowledgments, but that I have no Inclination for his way of Diſputing: Railing is a mean, and unchriſtian Talent, and oftentimes a ſign of

a

a deſperate Cauſe, and a deſperate Conſcience.

As to the bad Imputations theſe *Stage*-Advocates would throw upon me, I am not in the leaſt diſturb'd at Them. I thank God, they are not only without Truth, but without Colour. Could They have made the Slander paſſable, we ſhould have heard farther from them. This is an admirable way of anſwering Books! All that I ſhall ſay to't is, that I pity the Men and deſpiſe the Malice. To proceed. Mr. *Congreve* is now making *Outworks* to fortify the Gariſon. He lays down four Rules as the Teſt of Criticiſm and Comedy. Theſe He calls *Poſtulata*, as if they were Principles of *Science* and carried the Evidence of an *Axiom*. And after he has ſpent ſome *Pages* in ſetting down theſe Demonſtrative Things, he frankly tells us, they *ſeem at firſt Sight* to *comprehend* a *Latitude*. Do they ſo? Then they are not ſelf evident; They are unqualified for the Poſt he has put them in; and prove nothing but Sophiſtry, and Legerdemain. Well! What tho' theſe Rules are falſe in themſelves, Mr. *Congreve* promiſes to make them true before he has done with them. For they ſhall be ſo *limited* and *reſtrain'd*, and uſed with ſuch Diſcretion; that the *Reader* ſhall be perfectly

P. 7. P. 12.

Ibid.

Ibid.

fectly indemnifyed. However, I can't help ſuſpecting theſe fair Words: For if He intends to deal clearly, why does he make the Touchſtone Faulty, and the Standard uncertain? For theſe Reaſons, I muſt examine for my ſelf; And ſince he owns his *Propoſitions* not evidently true, I'll try if I can't prove the greateſt part of them evidently falſe.

P. 7. To begin with him. His Latitude of *Comedy* upon *Ariſtotle*'s Definition; as he Explains it, won't paſs without Limitation. For

1*ſt*. His Conſtruction of Μίμησις φαυλοτέρων is very queſtionable. Theſe Words may as properly be tranſlated the *Common*, as *the worſt Sort of People*. And thus *Heſychius* interprets Φαῦλος by εὐτελής.

2*ly*. *Comedy* is diſtinguiſh'd from *Tragedy* by the Quality of the Perſons, as well as by other Circumſtances. *Ariſtotle* informs us that the Appearance, Characters, or Perſons are greater in *Tragedy*, than in *Comedy*. Τὰ σχήματα μείζω καὶ ἐνημότερα And to this Senſe *Petitus* interprets the Words βελτίονας ἢ χείρονας, affirming they ought to relate to Quality, as well as Manners.

Lib. de *Poet.* cap. 4.

In not. ad Lib. *Ariſt.* de Poet, cap. 2.

Now as the Buſineſs of *Tragedy* is to repreſent Princes and Perſons of Quality; ſo by the Laws of Diſtinction, *Comedy* ought

ought to be confin'd to the ordinary Rank of Mankind. And that *Ariſtotle* ought to be thus interpreted appears from the Form of *New Comedy*, ſet up in the Time of this Philoſopher. And tho' we have none of theſe *Comedies* extant, 'tis agreed by the Criticks that they did not meddle with Government and Great People; the *Old Comedy* being put down upon this Score. And tho' *Menander* and the reſt of that Set are loſt, we may gueſs at their Conduct from the Plays of *Plautus* and *Terence*, in all which there is not ſo much as one Perſon of Quality repreſented: Excepting *Plautus*'s *Amphitryon*, which he calls a *Tragecomedy*. Scalig. Poet. Lib. 1. c. 6.

Farther, Mr. *Congreve*'s Reaſon why *Ariſtotle* ſhould be interpreted by *Manners*, and not *Quality* is inconcluſive. His remark on κατὰ πᾶσαν κακίαν will ſerve as well the other way. Lets try it a little: *Ariſtotle* ſhall ſay then that *Comedy* is an imitation of the ordinary, and middle ſort of People, but not κατὰ πᾶσαν κακίαν *in every branch and aggravation of Vice*; for as Mr. *Congreve* obſerves, *there are Crimes too daring and too horrid for Comedy*. Now I deſire to know, if this Senſe is not clear and unembaraſs'd, if it does not diſtinguiſh *Comedy* from *Tragedy*, and bring down the Definition to matter of Fact? Amend. p. 8.

But granting Mr. *Congreve* his Definition; all Blemiſhes and Inſtances of Scandal are not fit to make ſport with. Covetouſneſs, and Profuſion; Cowardize, Spleen, and Singularity, well managed, might poſſibly do. But ſome Vices Mr. *Congreve* confeſſes *are too daring for Comedy*. Yes and for *Tragedy* too. And among theſe I'll venture to ſay Profaneneſs is one. This Liberty even *Ariſtotle* durſt not allow: He knew the Government of *Athens* would not endure it. And that ſome of the *Poets* had been called to account upon this Score.

Vit. Eurip. Ed. Cant.

2*ly*. Immodeſty and Lewd Talking, is another part of Vice which ought not to appear in *Comedy*. *Ariſtotle* blames the *Old Comedians* for this ſort of Miſmanagement; and adds, that intemperate Rallying ought to lie under publick Reſtraint. And therefore Mr. *Congreve* is miſtaken in his Conſequence if he makes it general. For *the looſer ſort of Livers*, as to the Foulneſs of Converſation, are no proper *Subject of Comedy*.

See View, &c. p. 159. 160.

Amend. p. 8.

But ſuppoſing *Ariſtotle* more liberal to Mr. *Congreve*, what ſervice would it do him? Does not Chriſtianity refine the Pleaſures, and abridge the Liberties of *Heatheniſm*? St. *Paul* bids us *put away all filthyneſs and fooliſh talking*, and that ſuch

Epheſ. 5, 3, 4.

things

things *ought not so much as to be named amongst Christians*. And when *Revelation* says one thing, and *Paganism* another, how are we to determine? Is not an *Apostle*'s Testimony more cogent than that of a Philosopher, and the *New Testament* above all the Rules of *Aristotle* and *Horace*? Colos. 3. 8.

Thus we see his first *Postulatum* is far from being true in the generality stated by him.

Before I part with him on this Head, I can't but take notice of his saying, that *the Business of Comedy is to delight, as well as instruct*: If he means as much, by *as well*, he is mistaken. For Delight is but the secondary End of *Comedy*, as I have prov'd at large. And to satisfie him farther, I'll give him one Testimony more of Mr. *Dryden*'s. 'Tis in his *Preface* to *Fresnoy*'s *Art of Painting*. Here he informs us that as to Delight *the Parallel of the* (two) *Arts holds true*; *with this difference*; *That the principle End of Painting is to please, and the chief design of Poetry is to instruct*. P. 8. View, &c. cap. 4. P. XX.

Thus Mr. *Congreve*'s first Rule signifies little; and therefore his *Second* being, but a consequence of it, must fall of Course. *Pleasure*, especially the Pleasure of *Libertines*, is not the Supreme *Law of Comedy*.

Vice

Vice muſt be under Diſcipline and Diſcountenance, and Folly ſhown with great Caution and Reſerve. Luſſious Deſcriptions, and Common Places of Lewdneſs are unpardonable. They affront the virtuous, and debauch the unwary, and are a Scandal to the Country where they are ſuffer'd. The pretence of *Nature*, and *Imitation*, is a lamentable Plea. Without doubt there's a great deal of *Nature* in the moſt brutal Practices. The infamous *Stews* 'tis likely talk in their own way, and keep up to their Character. But what Perſon of Probity would viſit them for their Propriety, or take Poyſon becauſe 'tis true in its kind? All Characters of Immodeſty (if there muſt be any ſuch) ſhould only be hinted in remote Language, and thrown off in Generals.

If there muſt be Strumpets, let *Bridewell* be the *Scene*. Let them come not to Prate, but to be Puniſhed. To give Succeſs, and Reputation to a *Stage Libertine*, is a ſign either of Ignorance, of Lewdneſs, or Atheiſm, or altogether. Even thoſe Inſtances which will bear the relating ought to be puniſh'd. But as for Smut and Profaneneſs, 'tis every way Criminal and Infectious, and no Diſcipline can atone for the Repreſentation: When a *Poet* will venture on theſe Liberties, his *Perſwaſion* muſt

Amend. p. 11.

muſt ſuffer, and his *private Sentiments* fall under Cenſure. For as Mr. *Dryden* rightly obſerves, *vita proba eſt*, is no excuſe: For *'twill ſcarcely be admitted that either a* Poet *or a* Painter *can be chaſt, who give us the contrary Examples in their Writings, and their Pictures.* I agree with Mr. *Congreve it would be very hard a Painter ſhould be believ'd to reſemble all the ugly Faces he draws.* But if he ſuffers his Pencil to grow Licentious, if he gives us Obſcenities, the Merits of *Raphael* won't excuſe him: No, To do an ill Thing well, doubles the Fault. The Miſchief riſes with the Art, and the Man ought to ſmart in proportion to his Excellency: 'Tis one of the Rules in Painting according to Mr. *Dryden* and *Freſnoy*; To *avoid every Thing that's immoral and filthy, unſeemly, impudent, and obſcene.* And Mr. *Dryden* continues, that a Poet is bound up to the ſame Reſtraint, and ought neither to *Deſign*, or *Colour* an offenſive Piece.

Pref. to *Freſnoy*. p. XXI.

Pref. p. XX. Book. p. 56.

Ibid. p. XXI.

Mr. *Congreve*'s *4th.* Propoſition relates to the *Holy Scriptures*; And here he endeavours to Fence againſt the Cenſure of Profaneneſs. He deſires the following Diſtinction *may be admitted*, viz. *when Words are applied to ſacred Things, they ought to be underſtood accordingly*: But *when they are otherwiſe applied, the Diverſity of the Subject*

Amend. p. 11.

ject gives a Diverſity of Signification: By his favour this Diſtinction is looſe, and nothing to the Purpoſe. The inſpired Text is appropriated to *Sacred Things*, and never to be uſed but upon ſerious Occaſions. The Weight of the Matter, and the Dignity of the Author, challenge our utmoſt regard. 'Tis only for the Service of the *Sanctuary*, and Privileged from common Uſe. But Mr. *Congreve* ſays *when they* (the Words of Scripture) *are otherwiſe applied, the Diverſity of the Subject gives a Diverſity of Signification.* This is ſtrange Stuff! Has Application ſo tranſforming a Quality, and does bare uſe enter ſo far into the Nature of Things? If a Man applies his Money to an ill Purpoſe, does this tranſmute the Metal, and make it none of the Kings Coin? To wreſt an Author, and turn his Words into Jeſt, is it ſeems to have nothing to do with him. The meer Ridicule deſtroys the Quotation; and makes it belong to another Perſon. Thus 'tis impoſſible to Traverſtie a Book, and *Virgil* was never burleſq'd by *Auſonius* or Mr. *Cotton*! Not at all! They only made uſe of the 24 Letters, and happen'd to chop exactly upon *Virgil's* Subject, his Words and Verſification. But 'tis plain they never intended to quote him: For *Virgil* is always

ways grave and ſerious, but theſe Gentlemen apply, or tranſlate the Words in the moſt different manner imaginable: And run always upon Buffoonry and Drolling. This is Mr. *Congreve*'s Logick, and to abuſe an Author is to have nothing to do with him. The Injury it ſeems deſtroys the Relation, and makes the Action perfectly foreign. And by this Reaſoning one would think my Book had never been cited by Mr. *Congreve*.

To illuſtrate the Matter a little farther. Suppoſe the moſt ſolemn Acts of Government play'd the Fool with at *Bartholomew Fair*; The Judges *Charge* made up into a *Farce*, and the *Poppets* repeating an *Act of Parliament*: Would it be a good excuſe to alledge they meant nothing but a little Laughing. That the *Bench* and the *Bear-Garden*, *Punchinello* and the 2 *Houſes*, had the *ſame Alphabet in common*? That they ought to have the Privilege of Speech, and put their *Words* together as they had a mind to: Would not the Reaſon and the Hardineſs of ſuch a Plea, be very extraordinary? The Caſe before us is much the ſame, only a great deal worſe. For what can be more outrageouſly Wicked, than to expoſe Religion to the Scorn of Atheiſm, to give up the Bible to *Rakes* and *Strumpets*, *Old Bailey.* P. 39. 49.

Love for Love. p. 59. 61. *Double Dealer.* p. 18, &c.

Strumpets, and to make Impudence and Inſpiration ſpeak the ſame Language? Thus the Wiſdom of God is burleſqu'd, his Omnipotence play'd with, and Heaven's the Diverſion of Hell. To reply, that tho' the *Words are Scripture, the Subject and Application are different*, is to confeſs the Indictment, and give up the Cauſe. For pray what is it to burleſque a grave Author? Is it not to wreſt his Meaning, and alter his Matter; to turn him into Jeſt and Levity, and put him under Circumſtances of Contempt?

Thus we ſee his 4*th.* Propoſition is all Sophiſtry, and falſe Reaſoning:

I ſhall now go back to his 3*d.* which I think would have ſtood as well in the laſt place. He *deſires the impartial Reader, not to conſider any Expreſſion or Paſſage, cited from any Play, as it appears in* my Book; *nor to paſs any Sentence upon it out of its proper Scene*, &c. For it muſt not be medled with *when 'tis alienated from its Character.* Well! Let the *Reader* compare his *Plays* with the *View*, &c. as much as he pleaſes. However, there's no Neceſſity of paſſing through all his Forms, and Methods of preſcribing. For if the Paſſage be truly cited, if the Sentence be full, and determin'd, why mayn't we underſtand it where'ere 'tis met with?

P. 9. 10.

Why

Why muſt we read a Page for a Period? Can't a Plant be known without the Hiſtory of the Garden? Beſides, He may remember I have frequently hinted his *Characters*, touch'd upon their Quality and Fortune, and made them an Aggravation of his Fault.

But to ſilence this Plea, I had told him before that no pretence of Character, or Puniſhment could juſtify Profaneneſs on the *Stage*. I gave him my Reaſons for't too, which he is not pleaſed to take notice of. To enlarge on them a little: View. p. 96.

And here I deſire to know what Service does Blaſphemy, and Profaneneſs upon the *Stage*? Is it to pleaſe, or to improve the Audience? Surely not the firſt: For what Pleaſure can it be to ſee the greateſt Being contemn'd, the beſt Friend ill treated, and the ſtrongeſt Enemy provok'd? The *Jews* uſed to rend their Cloaths at the hearing of Blaſphemy, and is it now become the Entertainment of Chriſtians? To ſee Men defy the Almighty, and play with Thunder, one wou'd think ſhould be far from Diverſion. Are the Charms of Profaneneſs ſo ſtrangely inviting, is there ſuch Muſick in an Oath, and are the Damn'd to be courted for their Company? The *Stage* is oftentimes a lively Emblem of Hell;

There's

There's the Language, and the Lewdneſs; There are the Devils too, and almoſt every thing but the Darkneſs and Deſpair. Theſe hideous Characters are generally Perſons of Figure, often rewarded, ſeldom puniſh'd, and when they are, the Correction is ſtrangely gentle and diſproportion'd. 'Tis juſt as if a Man ſhould be ſet in the *Stocks* for Murther, and ſhamed a little for firing a Town.

To ſay a Man has been Profane in general, and then to puniſh him is ſomewhat Intelligible; To make him an Example without Inſtance, and Particularity, is a ſafe way of Dramatick Juſtice: But when he is ſuffer'd to Act his Diſtraction, and practiſe before the Company, the Puniſhment comes too late. Such Malefactors are infectious, and kill at their very Execution. 'Tis much ſafer not to hear them talk, than to ſee them ſuffer. A bad Age is too apt to learn; and the Puniſhment in jeſt, brings on the Crime in earneſt. Some Vices wont bear the naming: They are acted in ſome meaſure when they are ſpoken, and approv'd when they are hearkn'd to. Thus the *Play-Houſe* often ſpreads thoſe Vices it repreſents, and the Humour of the *Town* is learned by ſhewing it. So that if Inſtruction is intended, nothing can be more

more Ignorant, if Diverſion nothing more Wicked. To proceed. Prophaneneſs by being often heard, is leſs abhorr'd. The averſion cools upon Cuſtom, and the frightfulneſs of the Idea is abated. Familiarity reconciles us to ill Sights, and wears off the Deformity of a Monſter. Thus by Curſing and Swearing, the Abuſe of *Scripture* and Profane Jeſts, which are ſo frequent on the *Stage*, the Boldneſs of the Crime grows leſs remarkable, and the Terrors of Conſcience are laid aſleep: And if there happens to be Wit in the Caſe, 'tis a Vehicle to the Poyſon, and makes it go down with Pleaſure. Thus young People are furniſhed with Profane Jeſts, and Atheiſm is kept in Countenance: The Majeſty of Religion is weaken'd, and the Paſſions of Human Nature miſplaced: People laugh when they ſhould tremble, and deſpiſe what they ought to adore. Had we a due regard for the Honour of God, and were Death and Judgment laid before us, that is, were we Chriſtians in good earneſt; theſe wretched Liberties would be all Pain, and Pennance to us: They'd wound the Senſe, and chill the Blood, and make us ſweat with Antipathy and Diſguſt: We ſhould be ſeiz'd with a fit of Horror, and almoſt frighten'd into Agony and Convulſion.

From what I have ſaid 'twill follow, that provided Mr. *Congreve* is fairly cited for Smut, or Profaneneſs, *Sentence may be paſſed* without having recourſe to *Scene*, or *Character*. I ſay it may be paſſed ſo far as to condemn him of a Fault; Tho' I confeſs the degrees, and aggravation of it, will in ſome meaſure depend on the *Characters*, and the Fortune of them.

I have done with Mr. *Congreve*'s Preliminaries, and ſhown the unreaſonableneſs of them. If he demands them as a Right, his Title is defeated, if he begs them as a Favour, he ſhould have petition'd in another Form. He ſhould not have been ſo ſhort with the *Reader* as to

Amend. P. 7. *deſire him to proceed no farther, but return to my View*, &c. *if he thought in his Conſcience his few things too much to be granted.* But why ſhould this Gentleman put this hardſhip upon People, which he does not allow of himſelf? I ſuppoſe Mr. *Congreve*'s Conſcience may be large enough for any *Reader*, why then does he require any more? The Author thinks his *few things*, *too much* to be granted, and yet the *Courteous Reader* muſt think otherwiſe! I ſay

P. 12. Mr. *Congreve* thinks them *too much*, why elſe does he engage to uſe them with ſuch Caution, to muzzle, and bind them up to their good Behaviour?

Mr.

Mr. *Congreve* proceeds to acquaint us how careful the *Stage* is for the *Inſtruction* of the *Audience*. That *the Moral of the whole is generally ſumm'd up in the concluding Lines of the Poem, and put into Rhyme that it may be eaſy and engaging to the Memory.* P. 12, 13. To this I anſwer,

1*ſt*. That this *Expedient* is not always made uſe of. And not to trouble the *Reader* with *many* Inſtances, we have nothing of it in *Love in a Nunnery*, and the *Relapſe*, both which *Plays* are in my Opinion not a little dangerous.

2*ly*. Sometimes theſe Comprehenſive Lines do more harm than good: They do ſo in *the Soldiers Fortune*: They do ſo likewiſe in the *Old Batchelour*; which inſtructs us to admirable purpoſe in theſe Words;

But Oh——

What rugged ways attend the Noon of Life?
(Our ſun declines) and with what anxious ſtrife,
What pain we tug that galling Load a Wife?

This Moral is uncourtly, and vitious, it encourages Lewdneſs, and agrees extreamly well with the *Fable*. *Love for Love* may have ſomewhat a better Farewel, but would do a Man little Service

ſhould he remember it to his dying Day. Here *Angelica* after a fit of Profane Vanity in *Proſe*, takes her Leave as follows;

The Miracle to Day is that we find
A Lover true: Not that a Woman's kind.

This laſt Word is ſomewhat ambiguous, and with a little help may ſtrike off into a light Senſe. But take it at the beſt, 'tis not overloaden with Weight and Apothegme. A *Ballad* is every jot as ſententious.

3*dly*. Suppoſing the Moral grave, and unexceptionable, it amounts to little in the preſent Caſe. Alas! The Doctor comes too late for the Diſeaſe, and the Antidote is much too weak for the Poyſon. When a *Poet* has flouriſhed on an ill Subject for ſome Hours: When he has Larded his *Scenes* with Smut, and play'd his Jeſts on Religion; and exhauſted himſelf upon Vice; what can a dry Line or two of good Counſel ſignify? The Tincture is taken, the Fancy is preingaged, and the Man is gone off into another Intereſt. Profane Wit, Luſcious Expreſſions, and the handſome Appearance of a *Libertine*, ſolicit ſtrongly for Debauchery. Theſe Things are mighty Recruits to Folly, and make the Will too hard for the Underſtanding.

ſtanding. A taſte of Philoſophy has a very flat reliſh, after ſo full an Entertainment. An agreeable Impreſſion is not eaſily defac'd by a ſingle Stroak, eſpecially when 'tis worn deep by Force, and Repetition. And as the *Audience* are not ſecur'd, ſo neither are the Poets this way. A Moral Sentence at the Cloſe of a Lewd Play, is much like a pious Expreſſion in the Mouth of a dying Man, who has been Wicked all his Life time. This ſome ignorant People call making a good End, as if one wiſe Word would attone for an Age of Folly. To return to the *Stage*. I ſuppoſe other Parts of a Diſcourſe beſides the Concluſion, ought to be free from Infection. If a Man was Sound only at his Fingers Ends, he would have little Comfort in his Conſtitution. *Bonum fit ex integra Cauſa*; A good Action muſt have nothing bad. The Quality muſt be uniform, and reach to every Circumſtance. In ſhort. This Expedient of Mr. *Congreve*'s as 'tis inſignificant to the purpoſe 'tis brought, ſo it looks very like a piece of formal Hypocricy: And ſeems to be made uſe of to conceal the Immorality of the *Play*, and Cover the *Poet* from Cenſure.

Mr. *Congreve* in the *Double Dealer* makes three of his Ladies Strumpets; This, I

thought an odd Compliment to *Quality*. But my Reflection it ſeems is over ſevere. However, by his Favour, the Characters in a *Play* ought to be drawn by Nature: To write otherwiſe is to make a Farce. The *Stage* therefore muſt be ſuppos'd an Image of the World, and Quality in Fiction reſemble Quality in Life. This Reſemblance ſhould likewiſe hold in Number, as well as in other Reſpects, tho' not to a Mathematical ſtrictneſs. Thus in *Plautus* and *Terence*, the *Slaves* are generally repreſented falſe, and the Old Men eaſy and over credulous. Now if the Majority in theſe Diviſions ſhould not anſwer to the *World*; If the *Drama* ſhould croſs upon *Converſation*, the *Poets* would be to blame, as I believe they are in the latter Inſtance. Thus when the greateſt part of *Quality* are debauched on the *Stage* 'tis a broad *Innuendo* they are no better in the *Boxes*.

This Argument he pretends proves too much, and would make us believe that by this way of reaſoning, *if four Women were ſhewn upon the Stage, and three of them were vitious, it is as much as to ſay that three parts in four of the whole Sex are ſtark naught.* P. 16. I anſwer, the Caſe is not parallel. The Repreſentation in his *Play* turns more upon Condition than Sex, 'Tis the *Quali-*

ty

ty which makes the Appearance, marks the *Character*, and points out to the Compariſon Abroad.

His Precedents from *Virgil* are unſerviceable upon two Accounts.

1*ſt*. The Fact is miſreported The Catalogue of ill Women in that *Poem*, is not ſo numerous as is pretended. Mr. *Congreve* exempts four of them from this Charge, and I'll help him to four more. For *Creuſa* and *Lavinia* are perfectly paſſive; and over-ruled. Then as for *Camilla*, why is ſhe Thrown into the black Liſt, and rang'd with *Alecto* and the *Harpyes*? What *Decrees of the Gods does ſhe deſpiſe*? She ſtood by *Latinus* 'tis true, neither does the *Poet* oblige her to quit his Intereſt. So that for any thing that appears, the Lady was a good Woman in her way. To theſe if we add *Anna*, *Dido*'s Siſter, a very Innocent Princeſs, I believe we may venture to Poll with *Juno*, and all her Party.

2*ly*. His Matter of Fact as ſtated by himſelf, makes againſt him. For if *Virgil* did well in making moſt of his Female Characters faulty and exceptionable, *becauſe as* Ariſtotle *has ventur'd to affirm, there are more bad than good Women in the World*, then there ought to be a Proportion between Life and poetick Imitation; *Congr.* p. 17.

A Proportion even to Computation, tho' not juſt to equality and telling of Noſes. and thus his Illuſtration deſtroys his Argument, even by the Authority of *Ariſtotle* and *Boſſu*; and which is worſt of all, by his own, who cites them with Approbation.

Ibid. There's one unlucky thing behind: And that is his concurring with *Ariſtotle* in a very unceremonious Paradox. This Philoſopher *has ventur'd to affirm that there are more bad, then good Women in the World.* Very likely? If he had ſaid there are more bad Men than good ones, the Diſcovery might have been altogether as conſiderable. But we are not yet at the end of the Ibid. Indictment. For as he goes on, *The Women* (take them altogether) *do more harm than good.* Well. *Ariſtotle* was a bold Man: However, this is to be ſaid for him; he was no *Stage Poet.* Had his concerns been with the *Pit* or *Boxes*, 'tis likely you had ſeen him better poliſh'd. But that Mr. *Congreve* ſhould Countenance an Author in his Misbehaviour, and make his Court thus awkardly to the Ladies, is ſomewhat ſurprizing. Is this the way to oblige the Women, to tell them *they do more harm than good in the World*; that their Sex is a Publick Nuſance, and an Errour in Creation?

I had charg'd our Modern Dramatiſts, and particularly Mr. *Congreve* with being too free in expoſing the Nobility under Characters of Lewdneſs and Contempt. This I obſerv'd was no Cuſtom of the *Roman Stage*; And that *Plautus* and *Terence*, were much more courtly and reſerv'd. This Remark he endeavours to diſprove from *Perſius* and *Juvenal*. As how? Did theſe Authors write either *Comedy* or *Tragedy*, or have their Citations any Reference to the *Drama*? Not at all: Why then are they alledg'd? To what End is a foreign Character and Buſineſs haled in to determine upon the *Stage*? Well. But theſe *Poets* were Satyriſts, and play'd their Invectives upon *Quality*, and is not this ſomewhat to the Purpoſe? But very little. For,

View. p. 12, 175.

Amend. p. 19.

1*ſt*. The Satyr of a *Comedian* and an other *Poet*, have a different Effect upon Reputation. A Character of Diſadvantage upon the *Stage*, makes a ſtronger Impreſſion than elſewhere. Reading is but Hearing at the Second Hand: Now Hearing at the beſt, is a more languid Conveyance than Sight. For as *Horace* obſerves,

Segnius irritant animos demiſſa per Aurem,
Quam quæ ſunt Oculis ſubjecta Fidelibus.— *De. Art. Poet.*

The

The Eye is much more affecting, and ſtrikes deeper into the Memory than the Ear. Beſides, upon the *Stage* both the Senſes are in Conjunction. The Life of the Action fortifies the Object, and awakens the Mind to take hold of it. Thus a Dramatick Abuſe is rivetted in the *Audience*, a Jeſt is improved into an Argument, and rallying grows up into Reaſon: Thus a Character of Scandal becomes almoſt indelible, a Man goes for a Blockhead upon *Content*; and he that's made a Fool in a *Play*, is often made one for his Life-time. 'Tis true he paſſes for ſuch only amongſt the prejudic'd and unthinking; but theſe are no inconſiderable Diviſion of Mankind. For theſe Reaſons, I humbly conceive the *Stage* ſtands in need of a great deal of Diſcipline and Reſtraint: To give them an unlimited Range, is in effect to make them Maſters of all Moral Diſtinctions, and to lay Honour and Religion at their Mercy. To ſhew Greatneſs ridiculous, is the way to looſe the uſe, and abate the value of the Quality. Things made little in Jeſt, will ſoon be ſo in earneſt: For Laughing and Eſteem, are ſeldom beſtow'd on the ſame Object.

2*ly*. The Cenſures of *Juvenal* and *Perſius*, are very moderate, and remote in Mr. *Congreve*'s Citations. *Juvenal* comes

p. 19.

ſome-

ſomewhat the cloſeſt. He Rallies the Flattery and Partiality of the Times; and tells us that Gaming and Debauchery were Scandalous to little People; but when theſe Vices dwelt in great Houſes, they chang'd Complexion, and grew *Modiſh* and *Gentile*. Thus we ſee the *Poet* keeps within the Terms of Reſpect, ſlides over the *Quality*, and points rather upon the *Fortune* of the Libertine. Now had *Juvenal* written a *Comedy*, laid the Scene in his own Country, Created a Lord a *Coxcomb*, and ſhewn him ſuch for three hours together, his caſe had been ſomewhat hard. But this branch of *Satyr* was left for Mr. *Congreve*'s refining; who to do him right, has treated the Character with *much Delicacy of fine Raillery, and Excellency of good Manners*, as he Phraſes it.

Double Dealer.

Amend. p. 27.

His Teſtimony from *Rapin* does not come up to his Point. For as I obſerv'd, *Moliere* Ridicules no Quality higher than a *Marquis*: Now notwithſtanding Mr. *Dennis*'s Exclamation, a *Marquis* in *France* is much leſs than a *Marquis* in *England*, or a *Baron* either. This I take it is pretty plain from *Moliere* himſelf, for in his Play call'd *L' Impromptu de Verſailles*, *Brecourt* one of the Minor Nobleſs, treats a *Marquis* with great Familiarity. He calls him *Mon puavre Marquis*, and *Je te promet Mar-*

View. &c. p. 175.

P. 22. 29.

Marquis; now this way of ſpeaking is not Manners, unleſs to Equals, or Inferiors.

Critique de Eſcole des Femmes. p. 286, 287.

And in another Play, the *Chevalier Dorante* Converſes with a *Marquis* upon Terms of Equality, and *Climene* a Lady, ſalutes him only by the Title of *Monſieur*, whereas *Monſeigneur* belongs to the Quality of an *Engliſh* Lord. The *Orders* of the Biſhop of *Arras* run in this Stile; And ſo likewiſe does the Addreſs of two *French* Letters to the preſent Ld. Biſhop of *London*, printed at the end of a Book called the *Unreaſonableneſs of Separation*. Farther, *Rapin* ſeems to Cite *L' Impromptu* above-mentioned. Here *Moliere* informs us, that whereas Comedy formerly plaid the Fool with none but Slaves and Serving-Men, now the Caſe was alter'd, and there was no Sport without a ridiculous *Marquis*. But as for making bold *with People of Quality and the Court*, this is all added by *Rapin*. However, granting this the meaning and practice of *Moliere*, 'tis eaſily reconciled with the Senſe I am contending for. For a Perſon of Quality does not ſound ſo high in *French* as in *Engliſh*; the lower Nobleſs being often comprehended in this Diſtinction. Thus *Moliere*'s *Brecourt* is called a Man of Quality in the Liſt of the *Characters*, but

View, &c. p. 245.

L'Impromptu. &c.

but in the *Play* he is only *Chevalier*, or a Knight, at the beſt. And in his Play, called, *L' Bourgeois Gentil-Homme*, a Perſon of Quality often means no more than a Gentleman. And to proceed, thus we may fairly underſtand the remainder of *Rapin* in Mr. *Congreve*'s Citation. He tells us the other *Poets Play'd only upon Common and Country Converſation, in their Comedies, Et* Moliere *a joue tout* Paris *et la Cour. La Cour*, yes; but not *toute la Cour.* Here *Rapin* oppoſes, *La vie Bourgeoiſe*, Country Converſation, to the *Court.* Now *un Bourgeoiſe* ſignifies a Perſon of the *Third Eſtate*, as diſtinguiſh'd from the *Nobleſs*, or *Gentry.* So that the meaning of the Paſſage ſeems to be no more, than that *Moliere* took ſome of his *Fools* from the *Gentry*, which was more than the *Stage* had done before. But after all, if *Rapin* has miſ-reported *Moliere*, and given him more Liberty than he took, it makes nothing to Mr. *Congreve*'s purpoſe; for the force of the Teſtimony does not lye in what *Rapin* has ſaid, but in what *Moliere* has written.

P. 15. 31. & alib.

Furetiere.

Mr. Congreve is ſo hardy as to affirm that *I am in plain terms for having Complements paſs'd on Perſons of Quality, and neither will allow their Follies, nor their Vices to be expoſed.* This I confeſs is to be over-

over-Ceremonious. But the beſt on't is, there's nothing like it in the whole Book. The very place quoted by Mr. *Congreve* is a proof of the Calumny: The Paſſage ſtands in the Form of a Queſtion thus. *And can't they laſh the Vice, without pointing upon the Quality?* Which way of ſpeaking, ſuppoſes it a very practicable buſineſs; unleſs this Gentleman will affirm that *Folly*, and *Peerage*, are Inſeparable. I would gladly know what over-ſtraining of Ceremony, What Flatery is there in all this? I confeſs, I am of Opinion that all *Satyr* ought to have regard to Quality and Condition, and that Decency and Reproof ſhould go together. I can't think it any *Excellence of Good Manners*, to expoſe the *Nobility* in their *Robes*, to put Contempt among their Titles, and to repreſent them in ſuch a Manner, as if the Lord and the Fool, like Horſe and Man, in a *Centaur*, grew naturally together.

View, &c. P. 175.

Mr. *Congreve* proceeds in his Defence, and endeavors to wipe off the Imputation of *Smut* and *Pedantry* from Ld. *Touchwood*; But here he Cites more than is neceſſary: I had nothing to do with his *Verſes*, as the Reader may eaſily Imagine. 'Twas the *Proſe part* of Ld. *Touchwood* to which I Objected. And that I ſay ſtill is toul

Double Dealer P. 79. Amend. p. 22.

foul in the Image Embarraſs'd with trifling Epithites, and ill ſuited to the Character. But thus by producing the Innocent with the Guilty, he hop'd to make the Charge appear unreaſonable.

We are now come to the *Mourning-Bride*, and Mr. *Congreve* ſeems ſo well aſſur'd of the Decency of this *Play*, that he caſts the whole Cauſe upon it. *If there be Immodeſty in this Tragedy* (ſays he) *I muſt confeſs my ſelf incapable of ever writing any thing with Modeſty.* It may be ſo: An ill Cuſtom is very hard to conquer, with ſome People. But ſetting this Matter aſide; I ſtill charge Mr. *Congreve* with Immodeſty; 'tis in *Oſmin*'s laſt Speech in the *Page* above-mention'd. Indeed I did not Cite the Words becauſe I am not willing to furniſh the Reader with a Collection of Indecencies; to ſhew I deſign nothing but fair dealing, I always refer to the *Play*, and generally to the Character, and *Page*, where ſuch Entertainment is to be met with. This is preſſing the Charge as far as the Caſe will bear; But becauſe the Paſſages are unfit to be ſhown, Mr. *Congreve* and his Brethren deny the Fact: A great Inſtance of their Modeſty in another Senſe. Is it Innocence then to be guilty of things too bad to be nam'd? What ſort of Faults muſt thoſe

Amend. p. 23.

M. Bride, p. 36.

thoſe be, which won't endure the Light, tho' only to puniſh them.

This Gentleman quarrels with me becauſe I would have had *Almeria* and *Oſmin* parted *Civilly*; as if it was not proper for Lovers to do ſo: But *Civility*, and *Incivility have nothing to do with Paſſion.* I deny that, *Incivility* and *Paſſion*, are often concern'd together; And I ſuppoſe his *Amendments* may make an Inſtance.

Amend. p. 24.

Ibid.

By *Civilly*, I meant only decently, as any one might eaſily imagine. And as for *Tenderneſs*, when it grows Rank, and Nauſeus, 'tis Rudeneſs, I take it.

Mr. *Congreve* would excuſe *Oſmin*'s Rant, by ſaying, *That moſt of the Incidents of the Poem of this Scene and the former, were laid to prepare for the Violence of theſe Expreſſions.* If it be ſo, I think the Play was not worth the Candle. 'Tis much as Wiſe as it would be for a Man to make a long Preparation to get out of his Wits, and qualifie himſelf for *Bedlam.* For nothing can be more diſtracted than *Oſmin.* He is for *riving his clotted Hair, Smearing the Walls with his Blood, and daſhing his diſfigur'd Face againſt* ſomething. And a great deal more ſuch Stuff, as a Man may go to all the Mad-Houſes in Town, and ſcarcely hear of. Was it worth *Oſmin*'s while to be thus Crazy, and

M. Bride p. 36.

and are all Lovers to take a Pattern from this *Hero*? I am ſorry Mr. *Congreve* was at all this trouble for a Profane Alluſion; but he is poſitive there's nothing *either of Prophaneneſs or Immodeſty in the Expreſſion.* With *Immodeſty* I did not Charge it: But is there nothing of *Profaneneſs* in bringing the moſt ſolemn Things in Religion upon the *Stage*; In making a Mad-man Rave about *Heaven*, and in comparing the diſappointments of Love with *Damnation*? The Lines ſhall appear once again. Amend. p. 25.

O my Almeria;
What do the Damn'd endure but to deſpair;
But knowing Heaven to know it loſt for ever!

Mr. *Congreve* does not know how *theſe Verſes are a ſimilitude drawn from the Creed:* I can't help it. I thought the Eternal Puniſhment of the Damn'd had been part of the *Creed.* I ſhan't untie ſuch knots as theſe are for the future. He tells me *I had but an ill hold of Profaneneſs in his Play, and was reduc'd to catch at the Poetry*; And then makes a miſerable Jeſt about *Corruption* and *Generation. I had but ill hold of Profaneneſs*! As ill as 'twas, he has not yet wreſted it from me. 'Twas in my Power beſides to have taken better, and ſince he complains of gentle uſage, I ſhall do it. P. 26. Athanaſ. Creed. Ibid.

M. Bride p. 8, 9, 29, 41, 48. In the firſt place, here's frequent Swearing *by Heaven*; I ſuppoſe the *Poets* think this nothing, their *Plays* are ſo much larded with it. But our *Saviour* has given us an other Notion of this Liberty; He charges us *not to Swear at all.* And tells us expreſly, that *He that ſwears by Heaven ſwears by the Throne of God, and by him that ſits thereon.*

St. Mat. 5. 34. xxiii. 22.

To go on to another Branch of his *Irreligion.* The Scene of this *Play* lies in Chriſtendom, as is evident from the Hiſtory, or Fable; and to mention nothing more from *Oſmin*'s Rant: Let us ſee then how *Oſmin* accoſts *Almeria*, when he found her ſafe on Shore: Truly I think their *Meeting* is as extravagant as their *Parting*, tho' Mr. *Congreve* won't allow it ſhould be ſo. The Ceremony runs thus.

P. 36.

Amend. P. 24.

Mourn B. P, 19. *Thou Excellence, thou Joy, thou Heaven of Love.*

Thus the little Succeſſes of a pair of Lovers, are equall'd with the Glories of Heaven; and a paultry Paſſion ſtrain'd up to the Beatifick Viſion. I ſay paultry, for ſo 'tis upon the Compariſon. To go on. *Almeria* having ſomewhat of the *Play-Houſe* Breeding, is reſolved not to be wanting in the return of theſe Civili-

Civilities. She therefore makes him a Glorified Saint for the firſt piece of Gratitude, and then gives him a ſort of Power Paramount to *Omnipotence*, and tells him that God Almighty could not make her happy without him.

I *pray'd* to *thee* as to *a Saint*.
And *thou* haſt *heard* my *Prayer*, for *thou*
[art *come* P. 20.
To my Diſtreſs, to my Deſpair; which Hea-
[*ven*
Without thee could not Cure.

Almeria has another Flight, and ſhews the Rankneſs of her Wing every jot as much as in the former.

'Tis more than Recompence to ſee thy Face,
If Heaven is greater Joy, it is no Happineſs.

This is Mrs. *Brides* Complement, which both for the Religion and Decency is ſomewhat Extraordinary.

Manuel, a Chriſtian Prince, upon the news of a Rival, Swaggers at a moſt impious rate, *Paganiſm* was never bolder with *Idols*, nor *Jupiter* more brav'd by the *Gyants*. It runs thus.

[*ven*, Mourn.
Better for him to tempt the Rage of Hea- B. p. 26.

And wrench the Bolt red hiſſing from the
[Hand
Of him that Thunders, than but think ſuch
[Inſolence,
'Tis daring for a God.

And to make the Matter worſe, Mr. *Congreve* does not ſeem to think this Atheiſtical Sally a fault in *Manuel*. He lets us know he has puniſh'd him for his Tyranny, but not a word of his Profaneneſs.

Amend. P. 30.

Once more and I have done. *Oſmin*'s Careſſes of *Almeria* are an Original in their kind.

P. 35. *My all of Bliſs, my everlaſting Life,*
Soul of my Soul, and End of all my Wiſhes.

Here's Ceremony to Adoration; He makes her his Supreme Happineſs, and gives her Sovereign Worſhip: In ſhort, This Reſpect is the Prerogative of Heaven. 'Tis flaming Wickedneſs to ſpeak it to any thing leſs than God Almighty: And to ſet the Profaneneſs in the better Light, it runs all in devout Language, and Chriſtian Tranſport.

I come now to the Vindication of his Poetry: Where in the firſt place, he Complains extreamly; becauſe I Miſquoted *Waſting Air*, for *Wafting Air*.

Amend. P. 27.

Now

Now to my Mind, the reſtoring of the Text is a very poor relief. For this latter *Epithete* is perfectly expletive and foreign to the matter in hand; there's neither Antitheſis nor Perſpicuity in't. It neither clears the Senſe, nor gives Spirit to the Expreſſion: Beſides, the word is almoſt worn out of uſe, and were it otherwiſe, 'twould rather belong to the *Water*; For to *waft* a *Fleet* of *Merchants* is to Convóy them, but not, I ſuppoſe, through the Air: So that the *Poet* at beſt, ſeems to have miſtaken his Element. However, I ask his Pardon for tranſcribing an *s*, for an *f*, and expect he ſhould ask mine; for putting *Superſtition* upon me, and commenting upon his own Blunder, when 'twas Printed *Suppoſition* in all the three *Editions* of my Book. Amend. P. 44.

Mr. *Congreve* is now Cruizing for Repriſals, and bears down boldly upon a whole *Period*. *This Litter of Epithets*, &c. View, &c. He ſays *this Compariſon* of mine *is handſome*. p. 34. Why, ſo it may be for all his Diſproof: Amend. p. 29. Unleſs the ſtanding of it in his Book is enough to make it ridiculous. I confeſs there may be ſome thing in that, for bad Company is often a diſadvantage; beſides, I was illuſtrating his fine Sentences, and ſhowing his *Buckram* to the *Reader*: Upon this occaſion a little ſingularity in the

Expreſſion was not unſeaſonable. However I was ſenſible of it, and introduced it with Qualifying, and Caution.

Mr. *Congreve* in defence of ſome Lines of his Cited by me, Anſwers, that the *Diction of Poetry conſiſts of Figures, and the frequent uſe of Epithets.* I agree with him, but then the *Figures* ſhould be unforc'd, drawn with Proportion, and allyed to the matter in hand. The *Epithets* likewiſe muſt be Smooth, Natural and Significant. But when they are lean, and remote from the buſineſs, when they look hard and ſtiff, when they clog and incumber the Senſe, they are no great Ornaments. Whether Mr. *Congreve*'s are of this latter kind, or not, I ſhall leave it to the Reader to determine!

View, &c. P. 33, 34. Amend. P. 30, 31.

Ariſtot. Rhet. L. 3. C. 2.

After a hideous Collection of *Profaneneſs*, I expreſſed my ſelf with ſomewhat more than ordinary Concern, as was both very natural and proper; Amongſt other Expreſſions, I ſaid, *Nature made the Firment and riſing of the Blood for ſuch Occaſions.* By Nature I grant him, I meant nothing leſs than God Almighty. That our Mechaniſm was contrived ſo as to make our Paſſions ſerviceable; Our Conſtitution adjuſted to our Mind, and our Blood ſo diſpoſed as to reinforce the operations of our Reaſon. And pray what is there excepti-

ceptionable in all this? And where lies the miſtake, in *Religion*, or *natural Philoſophy*? I can hardly forgive my ſelf the taking notice of ſuch Objections as theſe. But Mr. *Congreve* was reſolv'd to make his *Logick* and *Drollery* of a piece, and I muſt *be produc'd* in *Ferment and Figure*, as he calls it. But this Expreſſion I ſhall leave with the *Reader*, and give him ſome time to make Senſe on't. He wonders after all, why *I ſhould uſe ſo much Vehemence*? Vehemence againſt what? Againſt *Profaneneſs* and *Blaſphemy*. Are theſe then ſuch harmleſs Practices, that they muſt be gently treated? Is the Honour of God, the Intereſt of Religion, and the Welfare of Humane Society ſo very inſignificant? Are theſe things beneath our Paſſions, and not worth the contending for? And won't they juſtifie a little warmth and expoſtulation in their behalf? *Chriſtianity is Mild*, 'tis true, but not in ſuch Caſes as this. The *Cretians* did not *Droll* upon their *Bible* like the Modern *Poets*, and yet St. *Paul* bids *Titus Rebuke them ſharply*. St. *Peter* likewiſe and St. *Jude* Laſh the Lewdneſs of the *Gnoſticks* with great Severity of Language. But he asks me *why all this Vehemence in a written Argument*? As if *Paper* would bear Senſe, no more than 'twill Ink ſometimes, or that People were ob-

Amend. P. 34.

Tit. 1. Pet. 2. 2. Ibid.

liged to write with greater Negligence than they talk. This was a ſhrewd queſtion! But queſtions are eaſily ſtarted.

Mr. *Congreve* is now come forward to the Vindication of his *Comedies*. He complains that in my Chapter of Profaneneſs, I *have repreſented him falſly or by halve*.

Amend. P. 36.

That I have quoted him falſly I deny; neither has he been able to prove it in the leaſt Inſtance: That he is ſometimes repreſented imperfectly I grant. His Immodeſty forced me upon this Method. He is often too offenſive to appear. To have ſhewn him to the Reader in this Condition, had neither been Civil, nor Safe. Why then does he find fault with this Reſervedneſs? Is he ſorry his Indecencies are conceal'd, and grown proud of his Misbehaviour?

We are now with the *Old Batchelour*, and Mr. *Congreve* pretends I'm unfair in not citing *Bellmour* more at length. He ſays I conclude *with a daſh, as if both the Senſe and the Words of the whole Sentence were at an end.* Juſt the contrary. I made a daſh——to ſhew there was ſomething more ſpoken: But though the *Sentence* was not at an End, the *Senſe* was; as appears from the Words, the Pointing, and the *Capital Letter* which follows. Let's ſee a little farther, if this Gentleman has

has received any harm. *Bellmour* is now talking to *Vainlove*.

Bell. *Couldſt thou be content to Marry* Araminta?

Vainlove replies in a very pious queſtion:

Vain. *Could you be content to go to Heaven?*

Bell. *Hum, not immediately in my Conſcience, not heartily:* ——*I'd do a little more good in my generation firſt in order to deſerve it.*

He would do a little more good firſt, *i. e.* He would gladly be a Libertine ſomewhat longer, and merit Heaven by a more finiſh'd courſe of Debauchery. Thus we are taught to interpret *Bellmour* by the *Old Batchelour* and the *Amendments*, &c. He is very lewd in the Progreſs of the *Play*, and Mr. *Congreve* grants, *he repreſents the Character of a wild Debauchee of the Town; and that the Expreſſion is light, and ſuited accordingly.* Amend. P. 38.

This is a good hearty Confeſſion, and a ſufficient proof, that if I had quoted more Words, I had quoted more Profaneneſs; and therefore Mr. *Congreve* has reaſon to thank me for being Brief.

Mr.

Mr. *Congreve* drops the Defence of *Fondlewife*, and makes merry with the Entertainment. His excuſe is, he was *very much a Boy when this Comedy was written.* Not unlikely. He and his Muſe might propably be Minors; but the Libertines there are full grown. But why ſhould the *Man* laugh at the Miſchief of the *Boy*, why ſhould he *publiſh* the Diſorders of his Nonage? and make them his own by an after Approbation? He *wrote it*, it ſeems, *to amuſe himſelf in a ſlow Recovery from a Fit of Sickneſs.* What his Diſeaſe was I am not to enquire; but it muſt be a very ill one, to be worſe than the Remedy. The Writing of that Play is a very dangerous Amuſement either for *Sickneſs*, or Health, or I'm much miſtaken.

Ibid. 39.

Ibid.

p. 40.

He pleads Guilty to the next Article of Impeachment; but then he is ſomewhat profane in his very Acknowledgment, and can't find in his Heart to give up an old Fault, without making a new one.

His next Attempt is to bring off *Bellmour*, who *Kiſſes* the Strumpet *Lætitia*, and tells her, *Eternity was in that Moment.* Mr. *Congreve*'s Anſwer is very ſurpriſing, He tells us, To ſay *Eternity is in a Moment, is neither good nor bad, for 'tis ſtark Nonſenſe.*

P. 40, 41.

By

By his favour, the matter is quite otherwiſe. If Mr. *Congreve* will have Patience, he ſhall ſpeak Nonſenſe by and by; and to make it the leſs a Fault, he ſhall do it unwillingly.

Whether this Gentleman borrow'd this Sentence, or made it, I can't tell; but there's juſt ſuch another in *Love Triumphant*; where upon ſuch an occaſion, *Alphonſo* tells *Victoria*: P. 34.

That Moment were Eternity in little.

Now if Mr. *Congreve* has not a mind to ſpeak Senſe, I hope Mr. *Dryden* may have leave to do ſo. However we'll prove our Right, and not ſtand to his *Courteſie*. Now to ſay of an Advantage that *Eternity was in that Moment*, is by common Interpretation meant, the Pleaſure of Eternity. The Satisfaction is ſuppos'd to be ſo great, that what is loſt in the Duration, is made up in the Quality. This in the preſent Application is hideouſly Profane; but the ſenſe and ſpirit of the Expreſſion is intelligible enough.

Mr. *Congreve* in the cloſe of his Paragraph is ſomewhat extraordinary. He pronounces the Citation *ſtark Nonſenſe*, and frankly declares, he *had not cared though I had diſcover'd it*. I think I have diſcover'd P. 41. it ſomewhat worſe. However, I wonder

der at his being ſo Reſign'd. What not care to have ſtark Nonſenſe found upon him; Not in a printed *Play*, and in the Mouth of the fine Gentleman! This is ſtrange indeed, and I could hardly believe it at firſt Sight: But the more I read of his *Amendments*, &c. the better I am aſſur'd of the Sincerity of his Confeſſion.

Lætitia has another lewd and very pro-
O. Batch. P. 39 View, &c. P. 63. fane Sentence given her, which I had taken notice of. To this Mr. *Congreve* anſwers, *'Tis the Expreſſion of a wanton and vicious Character, and that ſhe is diſcover'd in her Lewdneſs.* I reply in the firſt place,
Amend. P. 41. That my diſproof of his ſecond *Poſtulate*, or Propoſition, cuts off his retreat to this excuſe.

Secondly. She is not diſcover'd in her Lewdneſs, nor makes a diſhonourable Exit; and Mr. *Congreve* contradicts his own Play by affirming the contrary. For there's a Colour found out which paſſes upon the Credulity of *Fondlewife*, who declares himſelf ſatisfied with her Inno-
O. Batch. P. 39, 40. cence. Upon which *Bellmour* concludes the Fourth Act thus:

No Husband by his Wife can be deceiv'd,
She ſtill is Virtuous, if ſhe's ſo believ'd.

Sharper ſays to *Vainlove*,

I

I have been a kind of Godfather to you yonder, I have promis'd and vow'd ſome things in your Name, which I think you are bound to perform. Mr. *Congreve*'s anſwer is. That *he meant no ill by this Allegory, nor perceives any in't now.* No *ill in*'t that's ſtrange! Not in applying the ſolemn Engagements of Baptiſm to a ridiculous Subject, not in Burleſquing the *Church Catechiſm*? If theſe are no ill Things, there's no harm in Profaneneſs; and then I confeſs he has juſtified himſelf to purpoſe. O. Batch. p. 49. Amend. p. 42.

Before we part with the *Old Batchelour*, I'll give Mr. *Congreve* another Citation unmention'd before. O. Batch. p. 48.

Heartwell ſpeaking of Marriage, cries out, *O curſed State!*

How wide we err
When apprehenſive of the Load of Life
——We hope to find
That help which Nature meant in Womankind

It ſeems then Nature was as much miſtaken in the Proviſion, as Men are in the Experiment. Yes, for as the Poet goes on:

And Adam *ſure wou'd with more eaſe abide*
The Bone when broken, than when made a Bride. Ib. p. 48.

This is an admirable Comment on the Old

Old and New Teſtament, and the Office of Matrimony in the Common Prayer. The Thought looks like an Improvement of a Line in *Abſalom* and *Achitophel*: where the ſubject of the Poem is dated from the time of *Polygamy*,

E're one to one was curſedly Confined.

Abſal. & Achit. p. 1.

The *Provok'd Wife* has a Sentence not much ſhort of this.

p. 27. *Sure* (ſays Sir *John Brute*) *If Woman had been ready created, the Devil inſtead of being kick'd down into Hell, had been Married.*

View. &c. p. 64. We are now with the *Double Dealer*; where as I remark'd, Lady *Plyant* cries out *Jeſu*, and *talks Smut in the ſame Sentence.* Here again he pleads Guilty: He *had condemn'd it long ſince, and reſolved to ſtrike it out in the next Impreſſion.* Well! Repentance is a very commendable thing, and I heartily wiſh Mr. *Congreve* may go Through with it. But I'm afraid this good Reſolution of his went off in a little time: My Reaſon is, becauſe the *Double Dealer* was publiſh'd in 1694. and ſtands ſtill in the First *Edition*; But the *Old Batchelour* has been reprinted long ſince, the Sixth Impreſſion of this Play bearing date 1697.

Amend. p. 42.

1697. And yet here in this laſt Edition we have the exclamation *Jeſu*, uſed in a jeſting way, by the fulſome *Belinda*. If Mr. *Congreve* was diſpleas'd with the Profaneneſs in his *Double Dealer*, why did he not expunge it in his *Old Batchelour*? He can't deny but that Opportunity preſented fair a great while together. But here inſtead of asking Pardon of God and the World, and ſhewing himſelf concern'd for ſo ſcandalous an Expreſſion, He tells you a pleaſant Story (as he fancies) of a Letter of Advice from an *Old Gentlewoman, and a Widow, who as ſhe ſaid, was very well to paſs.* I ſuppoſe ſhe ſubſcrib'd her ſelf Old Gentlewoman, as Widows generally do, otherwiſe, as far as appears, he had been at a loſs for her Age. But to return, Either this Story is pretended or real. If 'tis a feigned caſe, 'tis nothing to his point. If 'tis matter of Fact, it makes againſt him. For then he makes a Jeſt of his own Reformation, Drolls upon *good Counſel*, and returns the Gentlewoman an Affront in Publick, for her Charitable Admonitions in Private. As for the *Smut*, he tells me, if there is any, *I may e'en take it for my pains.* Very generouſly argued! Since he is thus Noble, I'll omit the Scrutiny, and only refer to the Page.

Old Bat. p. 48.

Amend. p. 43.

Double D. p. 34.

And

And here the Reader may pleaſe to take notice, that the Word *Jeſu* is thrice made bold with, in deſpight of Religion and the Statute 3 *Jac.* 1. *cap.* 21.

D. Dealer. p. 7, 16, 78. Sir *Paul Plyant* among the reſt of his Follies, is mighty fond of the word *Providence*, and repeats it on ſeveral occaſions. From hence I drew this natural, or rather neceſſary Inference; that the meaning was to ſhew, that Senſe and Religion agreed ill together, and that none but Fools were fit to talk piouſly. Mr. *Congreve* inſtead of defending himſelf, endeavours to make me ſpeak Nonſenſe, but that lies all in his own miſquotation; as I have ſhewn already.

He pretends there's no profane Alluſion in his little Drollery about *Jehu*'s *being a Hackney Coachman*; and ſeems confident no other *Text* can be burleſq'd excepting *Lady Froth*'s *Poem*. He ſays Lady *Froth* calls the *Coachman our* Jehu, *and why might he not have that as well as any Jewiſh or Chriſtian Name?* I'll tell him for once. 'Twas never the Cuſtom of Jews or Chriſtians to take any *Scripture* Names from exceptionable Perſons. Neither *Jeroboam* nor *Jehu*, nor many others, were Religious enough for this purpoſe. No Man I believe ever heard of more than two *Jehu*'s, one in the *Kings*, and the other in the

Amend. p. 44, 45.

2 Kings 9. 20.

Double

Double Dealer. That Prince in the *Kings is ſaid to drive his Chariot furiouſly.* From hence the *Coachman*'s Character was Equipp'd. Both the Name and the Office, have a plain Reference to the Holy Text. Farther, *Lady Froth* does not call her Coachman by any Name in her Poem; by conſequence the Aſteriſm for direction, can never lead us to the meaning of her Verſes. For if *Jehu* is unmention'd in the Poetick Text, how can the Lady be explained by his ſtanding in the Margin? In ſhort, the worthy Myſtery can't be clear'd up without Recourſe to the *Scriptures*; And therefore without doubt we are much obliged to the Poet for this neceſſity. Thus 'tis plain the Bible is made bold with, and the turn of his expreſſion ſeems to reach the *Commentators* too. However, if his meaning is overſtrain'd in this later particular, it will do him very little Service; and I ask his excuſe. I am ſorry to ſpend ſo many words about ſuch Stuff as this is; but Mr. *Congreve* muſt have Juſtice done him.

Sir *Paul Plyant* will afford us ſomething worſe than the former; This *Wittol* of the Poet's making, tells his Lady he finds Paſſion *coming upon him by Inſpiration.* This I had reaſon to charge upon Mr. *Congreve* as a very profane Expreſſion:

In anſwer to this, He firſt rails a Sentence or two in his little way, and then very Magiſterially tells us, *That the Word Inſpiration, when it has Divine prefix'd to it, bears a particular and known ſignification; but otherwiſe to inſpire is no more than to Breath into; and a Trumpet,* &c. *may be ſaid without Profaneneſs to deliver a Muſical Sound by the help of Inſpiration.* By his favour, all People that talk *Engliſh* know, that Inſpiration, when it ſtands without Epithets and Addition, is always taken in a Religious ſignification. Inſpiration, and to be Inſpired, have a ſolemn and auguſt meaning in Chriſtianity. Theſe Words imply Divine Impulſe, and ſupernatural Aſſiſtance, and are oppos'd to ſuggeſtion of Fancy, and humane Reaſoning, to ſpeak by Inſpiration is to ſpeak by the *Holy Ghoſt*, as every Body can tell him: To be *ſaved* and *Salvation*, ſignified at firſt no more than Safety, and Eſcape: But if a Man ſhould ſay, *As he hop'd to be ſav'd*, and explain himſelf, that he intended no more, than that he hoped to get Cover before a Shower reach'd him; would he not be look'd upon as impertinently profane? If he call'd a lucky Leap of a Ditch *Salvation*, and pretended to juſtifie himſelf, that the word originally imports no more than Common De-

Amend. P. 45.

Deliverance, what Place would he be thought fit for? Thus when Words are made Incloſure, when they are reſtrain'd by Common Uſage, and tyed up to a particular Senſe: In this Caſe, to run up to Etymology, and Conſtrue them by *Dictionary* and *Præpoſition*, is wretchedly Ridiculous and Pedantick. *Horace* can tell him, that Cuſtom over-rules *Syllables*, and gives Law to Language. De Art. Poet.

Quem penes Arbitrium eſt, & jus & norma loquendi.

Mr. *Congreve* perceiving himſelf preſs'd retires with all Speed to his Fourth Propoſition. But that I have diſabled already. If he is poiſon'd with his Profaneneſs, and finds himſelf Sick, he muſt take what follows; for his Antidote is gone. To return to Sir *Paul*.

I find Paſſion (ſays he) *coming upon me by Inſpiration, and I cannot ſubmit as formerly.* D. Dealer. p. 19.

You ſee what an admirable reaſon he urges in Defence of his Folly, from the extraordinary Circumſtances of it! No *Prophet* could have juſtified his Reſentments from a higher pretence.

The fine Lady *Cynthia* out of her pious Education acquaints us, That *though Marriage makes Man and Wife one Fleſh, it leaves them ſtill two Fools.* But the little word STILL is left out in the Quotation; which like the Fly on the *Coach-Wheel*, raiſes a mighty Duſt. I grant I have by Chance omitted the word STILL; and if he had done ſo too, the Senſe had been perfectly the ſame, only better expreſſed. For *Still* is plainly uſeleſs, and comprehended in the Verb *Leaves. For if Marriage leaves 'em two Fools*, they are Fools after Marriage, and then they are Fools *Still*, I think; Nothing can be clearer than this. But beſides, *Cynthia* her ſelf won't allow of Mr. *Congreve*'s excuſe. For after ſhe has delivered that remarkable Sentence of *leaving 'em two Fools*, &c. *Mellifont* anſwers, *That's only when two Fools meet*, which is exactly Mr. *Congreve* in his *Amendments*. This *Cynthia* denies to be her meaning. *Cynth. Nay* (ſays ſhe) *I have known two Wits meet, and by the oppoſition of their Wits render themſelves as ridiculous as Fools.* And therefore after ſhe has given Matrimony an odd Name, ſhe adviſes him to Court no farther, to *draw Stakes and give over in time.* So that beſides Burleſquing the Bible, the Satyr is pointed againſt Marriage. And the

P. 47.

Double D. P. 18.

Folly

Folly is made to lye in the State, as well as in the Perſons. Upon the whole, we ſee the *Double Dealer*, and the *Amendments* can't agree; and thus two Blemiſhes, as well as two Beauties are ſometimes unlike to each other. Mr. *Congreve* ſays, *Ben. Johnſon is much bolder in the firſt Scene of his Bartholomew Fair.* Suppoſe all that. Is it an excuſe to follow an ill Example, and continue an Atheiſtical practice? I thought Mr. *Congreve in his penetration* might have ſeen through this Queſtion. *Ben. Johnſon* (as he goes on) *makes Littlewit ſay, Man and Wife make one Fool. I have ſaid nothing comparable to that.* Nothing comparable! Truly in the uſual ſenſe of that Phraſe, Mr. *Congreve*, 'tis poſſible, has ſaid nothing comparable to *Ben. Johnſon*, nor it may be never will: But in his new Propriety he has ſaid ſomething more than comparable, that is a great deal worſe. For though *Littlewit*'s Alluſion is profane, the words of the *Bible* are ſpared. He does not Droll directly upon *Geneſis*, or St. *Matthew*; Upon God the Son, or God the Holy Ghoſt: Whereas Mr. *Congreve* has done that which amounts to both. And ſince he endeavours to excuſe himſelf upon the Authority of *Ben. Johnſon*, I ſhall juſt mention what thoughts this Poet had of his pro- Amend. P. 47.

ſane Liberties, at a time when we have reaſon to believe him moſt in earneſt. Now Mr. *Wood* reports from the Teſtimony of a great Prelate then preſent.

Athen. Oxonien. Vol. 1. p. 519.

"That when *Ben. Johnſon* was in his laſt "Sickneſs, he was often heard to repent "of his profaning the Scriptures in his "Plays, and that with Horrour.

Now as far as I can perceive, the Smut and Profaneneſs of Mr. *Congreve*'s Four Plays out-ſwell the Bulk of *Ben. Johnſon*'s Folio. I heartily wiſh this Relation may be ſerviceable to Mr. *Congreve*, and that as his Faults are greater, his Repentance may come ſooner.

S. Ambro. *Quem ſecutus es peccantem, ſequere pœnitentem.*

The *Double Dealer* is now done with, and Mr. *Congreve* concludes his Vindication in his uſual Strain of Triumph and Aſſurance.

Love for Love comes at laſt upon the Board. In this *Play* I blamed him for making a *Martyr* of a Whoremaſter: Upon this he flies immediately for Succour to *Scapula*, and the *Greek Grammar*. He very learnedly tells us, that Martyr is a Greek *word, and ſignifies in plain Engliſh no more than a Witneſs*. Right! theſe two Words are the ſame; and when a

Cauſe

Cauſe comes on in *Weſtminſter-Hall*, the *Martyrs* are call'd immediately! But *Martyr* is but bare *Witneſs* in the Greek. Not always: Chriſtian Writers often uſe it in a ſenſe appropriated. And were it otherwiſe, there's no arguing from one Language to another. *Tyrant* was once an Honourable Name in *Greek*, but always a Reproach in *Engliſh*, But to dilate upon theſe Cavils, is throwing away time. If the Reader deſires more, he may pleaſe to look back on my Anſwer to his Objection about *Inſpiration.*

This *Poet*'s way of underſtanding *Engliſh*- puts me in mind of a late Misfortune which happened to a Country Apothecary. The Dr. had preſcrib'd a Lady Phyſick to be taken in ſomething Liquid, which the Bill according to Cuſtom call'd a *Vehicle.* The Apothecary being at a Stand about the Word, applies, as Mr. *Congreve* might have done, to *Littleton*'s *Dictionary.* And there he finds *Vehiculum* ſignified ſeveral conſiderable Things. He makes up the *Bill*, and away he goes to the Lady, where upon the Queſtion, how the Phyſick was to be taken? He anſwers very innocently; Madam, ſays he, you may take it in a *Cart*, or a *Waggon*, but not to give your Ladyſhip too much trouble, I think a *Wheelbarrow* may

do; for the word *Vehicle* in the Bill, will carry that ſenſe. In ſhort, This Direction was comply'd with, and the *Footman* drove the *Wheelbarrow* about the Chamber. To return to Mr. *Congreve*. I had ſaid that this Libertine Application of his, was dignifying Adultery with the Stile of Martyrdom; As if (ſays Mr. *Congreve*)

Ibid. *any word could dignifie Vice.* And pray why not? Does not the Varniſh hide the Coarſeneſs underneath, and the Pill go down the better for the Guilding? Whether he knows it or not, there's a great deal of Charm and Impoſture in *Words*; and an ill practice is often comply'd with upon the Strength of a Faſhionable Name.

p. 49. *He aſks, who told me Jeremy Fetch was bred at the Univerſity?* Why *Jeremy* ſays ſo himſelf pretty plainly, and *Tattle* ſays ſo, and I ſuppoſe Mr. *Congreve* ſays as much as that comes to in his Reflection immediately following. But this notable queſtion was put to introduce another Buſineſs of greater Conſequence. For upon this occaſion, out of *his excellence* of *good Manners*, he is pleaſed to obſerve, That *I ſhould not have been ſuſpected of an Univerſity Education any more than his Jeremy in the Play, if I had not Printed* M. A. *on the Title Page.* Here the Poor Man has ſhewn his Will, and his Weakneſs ſufficiently!

Love for L. p. 75. Amend. p. 50.

I'm

I'm almoſt ſorry 'tis ſo low with him. When a Poet is ſo extreamly well inclin'd to be witty, 'tis pity he has no more in his power. Mr. *Congreve* goes on Manfully in his Defence and ſays, *For the word Whoreſon, I had it from* Shakeſpear *and* Johnſon. Not unlikely. People are apt to learn what they ſhould not. Mr. *Congreve*'s Memory, or his Invention, is very conſiderable this way. Indeed one would almoſt think by his Writings, that he had digeſted ill Language into a common Place. But it was not only *Whoreſon*, but *Jeremy*'s ſaying he was born with *Whoreſon Appetites*, which I complain'd of; and which I take to be Blaſpheming the Creation. Amend. p. 50.

He pretends I have wrong'd him ſtrangely in a Rant of Sir *Sampſon*'s: And would make the Reader believe I charge him litterally with Paraphraſing the 139*th* Pſalm. I'm ſorry I am forc'd to explain my ſelf in ſo clear a Caſe. Amend. P. 51.

We may obſerve then, that the Pſalmiſt in Contemplation of the aſtoniſhing Beauty and Serviceableneſs of Humane Bodies, breaks out in a Rapture of Gratitude, *I will give Thanks unto thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made, marvellous are thy works, and that my Soul knows right well.* Let us now hear Sir *Sampſon*. Pſal. 139. v. 13.

This

This Gentleman after having railed a Lecture over *Jeremy*'s Body, for being born with neceſſities too big for his Condition; he crys, *theſe Things are unaccountable, and unreaſonable; why was not I a Bear?* --- *Nature has been provident only to Bears and Spiders*: Thus we ſee what a Harmony of Thought there is between *David* and our Author. The one Adores while the other Reproaches. The one Admires, the other Burleſques the wonders of Providence. And this was all the *Paraphraſing* I meant, as any one might eaſily Imagine.

Love for L. p. 25.

The Dialogue of *Scandal* and *Foreſight* lies next in our way, I ſhall once more Tranſcribe it from *Love for Love*.

P 44.

Fore. Alas Mr. *Scandal*, Humanum eſt errare.

Scand. you ſay true, Man *will err*; *meer* Man *will err*--- *but you are ſomething more*--- *There have been wiſe Men, but they were ſuch as you*---- *Men who conſulted the Stars, and were obſervers of Omens*,--- Solomon *was wiſe, but how? By his Judgment in Aſtrology.* ----- So *ſays Pineda* in his Third Book and eighth Chap. But (ſays Mr. *Congreve*) the *Quotation* of the *Authority* is *omitted* by Mr. Collier, *either becauſe he would* repreſent *it as my own Obſervation to ridicule the Wiſdom* of Solomon *or elſe becauſe he*

was

was indeed Ignorant that it belonged to any body elſe. To this I anſwer, Amend. P. 52.

1. That Mr. *Congreve* yeilds *Solomon's* Wiſdom ridiculed by *this Obſervation*, therefore by his own confeſſion, if 'tis none of his Authors, he muſt Anſwer for 't himſelf. Now *Pineda* gives us a quite different account of the Cauſe of *Solomon*'s Wiſdom, and which is perfectly inconſiſtent with Mr. *Congreve*'s Banter. "*Pineda* "affirms that *Solomon*'s Wiſdom was given "him by God in a ſupernatural Dream, "mentioned in Scripture. And that after "the Dream, he found an unuſual Light "in his Underſtanding; his Ideas were "brightn'd, and the extent of his Know- "ledge ſtrangely enlarged. 'Tis true. *Pi-* "*neda* beleived that *Solomon* underſtood "*Aſtronomy* in Perfection, and that he had "skill in *Prognoſticks* which he calls *A-* "*ſtronomia judiciaria.* He continues, that "he could in a great meaſure reach the In- "clinations and Reaſonings of Men, where "they did not depend purely upon choice, "and the turn of the *Will.* But then he "does not ſay that *Solomon*'s Skill in *Prog-* "*noſticks* was that which made him *wiſe.* "No: This Talent was only a Branch, "but not the Cauſe of his Wiſdom. For "as *Pineda* ſpeaks elſewhere, *Solomon* had "a Univerſal Knowledge of Nature, but "then

1. Kings 3. 5, 12. Pin. Lib. 3. Cap. 8. P. 142. 147. Ed. Mogunt. Lib. 3. C. 18. Ibid. Lib. 3. C. 10.

" then this Excellency was no reſult of " Natural parts, or Humane Induſtry; " 'Twas an immediate Bounty from Hea- " ven; And both the Thing, and the Con- " veyance, were extraordinary.

Mr. *Congreve* agrees with *Pineda* at leaſt in a jeſting way, *Solomon* was *wiſe, but how? By his Judgment in Aſtrology.* That is, his diſtinguiſhing Attainments were gained this way. There was nothing in the Caſe, but that he had looked into a Star ſomewhat farther than other People: He Learned his Wiſdom it ſeems from the *Caldæans*, or *Ægyptians*, or from ſome ſuch Book as *Lillies Almanack*. This is *Scandal*'s Solution of the Myſtery; and the beſt that I can make on it. For 'tis one thing to ſay that a Man is *wiſe* by *Aſtrology*, and another that *Aſtrology* or *Aſtronomy* was only a part of his Wiſdom. The one implies the Cauſe, and the other but a Branch of the Effect. The one excludes the Miracle, and the other affirms it. Upon the whole matter, Mr. *Congreve*, and *Pineda*, are not to be reconciled, ſo that by his own confeſſion he has *ridiculed the Wiſdom of Solomon*, and falſified his Author into the Bargain.

2*ly*. Suppoſing *Pineda* had been fairly reported by Mr. *Congreve*, the *Poet* had been much to blame; For then the Caſe had

had ſtood thus; *Pineda* as Mr. *Congreve* obſerves had ridiculed *Solomon*, and himſelf had done no leſs, by Citing him without Cenſure, and upon a Drolling Occaſion. For this Reaſon I waved the conſulting of *Pineda*, as well knowing that ſhould the Teſtimony have been right, the *Play* was certainly in the wrong. Beſides, 'tis ſomewhat to be ſuſpected Mr. *Congreve* never ſaw *Pineda*; My reaſon is, becauſe he falls twice into the ſame Miſtake, he Quotes the *Eighteenth* Chapter for the *Eight*, and to make it appear the more groſs, 'tis done in words of Length, and not in Figures. I hope for the future Mr. *Congreve* won't bring in *Solomon* to divert the *Play-Houſe*, nor compare him with Fools and Fortunetellers. Lov. for L. P. 44. Amend. P. 52.

Scandal's telling *Foreſight* he was *more than meer Man*, and ſecure from Miſtake upon that Score, is likewiſe a profane expreſſion. To affirm this of any Perſon, is as much as to ſay, he is either our *Saviour*, or a *Prophet*, or under ſome Miraculous Influence.

Scandal goes on with *Foreſight*, "and "ſays the Wiſe Men of the Eaſt ow'd "their Inſtruction to a Star, which is "rightly obſerved by *Gregory* the Great "in favour of *Aſtrology*. L. for L. P. 44.

Mr. *Con-*

Mr. *Congreve* vindicates this paſſage by ſaying, that *Scandal Banters Foreſight*, but *not the Audience*. Not Banter the Audience! He Affronts the Audience I'm ſure, if they have any Chriſtianity in them, by drolling upon a Miracle, at our Saviours Birth: He banters St. *Matthew* too, who has recorded the Miracle, and *Gregory* the great, who diſcourſes upon it.

Amend. 54. Judges 16. 30. Love for Love, p. 74. Ed. 3d.

Mr. *Congreve* is pleaſed ro ſay that *I am very angry that Sir Sampſon has not another Name*, becauſe *Sampſon is a Name in the Old Teſtament*. This is falſe in every ſyllable, as the Reader may ſee by conſulting my Book. But this I ſay, that Mr. *Congreve* has burleſqu'd the Hiſtory of *Sampſon*, and wreſted the *Scripture* into Smut.

There are two other profane Paſſages Cenſur'd by me in the ſame Page: Theſe he leaves as it were to ſhift for themſelves, and has not as yet, made them worſe by defending them: Excepting that he comes up with his old Cavil about the Word *Martyr*, which I have anſwer'd already.

The next place Mr. *Congreve* leads us to is *Bedlam*: And here he gives us three Reaſons for *Valentine*'s pretended Madneſs. The two later are ſomewhat extraordinary. He makes him Mad it ſeems

for

for a variation of the Character. A ſhrewd Contrivance, to put a Man out of his Wits for the ſake of Variety? For without doubt, Raving and Incoherence are wonderfully taking. I ſuppoſe Mr. *Congreve* made *Bellmour* talk Nonſenſe for this wiſe Reaſon. For 'tis a dull thing for a Man to be always tyed up to be Senſe, and confined to his Underſtanding. His third Reaſon for taking away Reaſon, is *becauſe Madneſs gives a liberty to Satyr, and authoriſes a Bluntneſs,* &c. *which would otherwiſe have been a Breach of Manners in the Character.* That is, it gives *Valentine* a Commiſſion to talk Smut, and abuſe his Father. But Mr. *Congreve* needed not to have given himſelf this trouble about *Valentine*: For *Valentine* when he was in his Wits, and under the Character of a fine Gentleman, had Breeding enough to be Smutty and Undutiful. Mr. *Congreve* would perſwade the Reader that I interpret him with too much Rigour, for making *Valentine* in his Lunacy ſay, *I am Truth,* &c. If this Point needs any farther Diſputing, we may take notice that our Bleſſed Saviour mentions the Word *Truth* in a ſolemn and peculiar manner. He ſometimes applies it to himſelf, ſometimes to the Holy Ghoſt, and ſometimes to the Revelation of the Goſpel. In ſhort,

Amend. P. 55.

Amend. P. 41.

Amend. P. 56.

Love for Love, p. 57, 58, 63.

Love for L. p. 7. 23, 24, 83. Ed. 3d.

Joh. 46. 17. viii. 32. xvii. 17, 18. xviii. 18, 31.

'tis

'tis as it were appropriated to the greateſt Perſons, and Things, mark'd as the Prerogative of God; and uſed in a Senſe of Emphaſis and Diſtinction. Let us compare St. *John*, and Mr. *Congreve* a little, and then we may eaſily judge, where the Fault lies.

St. *Thomas* anſwers our Bleſſed Saviour, *Lord we know now not whether thou go-*
Joh. 14. 6. *eſt, and how can we know the way? Jeſus ſaith unto him, I am the Way and the Truth, and the Life.* Sir *Sampſon* is at a loſs, Swears, and cries out, *I know not which way to go.* Valentine enquires, *Who's that,*
Love for L. p. 57. Ed. 3. *that's out of his way? I am Truth, and can ſet him right.*

Our Saviour aſſures his Diſciples, That he will ſend them the *Comforter*. And
Jo. 16. 13. that *when he the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth, and he will ſhew you things to come.*

The execrable *Valentine* ſays, *interrupt me not---I'll whiſper Prediction to thee, and thou ſhalt Propheſie. I am Truth, and can*
P. 62. 55. L. for Lo. 2d. & 3d. *teach thy Tongue a new Trick: I am Truth, and come to give the World the Lie.*

And is not this horrible Stuff? What can be more intolerable Boldneſs, than thus to uſurp the Regal Stile, to proſtitute the Language of Heaven, and apply it to Drollery and Diſtraction?

Mr.

Mr. *Congreve* is advanced to my 3*d* Chapter, concerning the Abuſe of the Clergy. As for the Diſſenting *Miniſters*, he ſays I charge him with nothing more than *Setter*'s, procuring their Habit for *Bellmour*. Under favour, this is a great Miſtake. The Pimp reads a Lecture of Abuſe upon the Habit, expoſes *Spintext* from Head to Foot, makes him both a Knave and a Libertine, and his Wife a Whore into the Bargain. The *View*, &c. has remark'd, *that Barnaby calls another of that Character Mr. Prig.* He does ſo. And *Fondlewife* repreſents him lewd in a luſcious Deſcription. Mr. *Congreve* replies, *what if his Name were Mr.* Prig, *or what if it were not*? Now 'tis poſſible he'll not like it, if I don't conſider theſe weighty Queſtions. I ſay then, If his Name was ſo, he has misbehav'd himſelf by putting him in his *Play*. If 'twere not ſo, he has uſed the Diſſenting Miniſters ill, by repreſenting one of their Order in a contemptuous Manner. For as he himſelf confeſſes, a Mr. *Prig, and a Mr. Smirk, are Names implying Characters worthy of Averſion and Contempt*. Now for a Man not to underſtand his own ill Language, and contradict himſelf in a few Pages, is, in his own decent expreſſion *furiouſly ſimple*.

Amend. p. 57.

View, &c. p. 102. Old Bat. p. 19. 20.

View. &c. p. 102.

Amend. p. 58.

Amend. p. 76.

Mr. *Congreve* pretends that a Reflection on a *Lord*'s *Chaplain* is no Reflection on a

Amend. P. 58. See O. B. p. 27.

Parſon of the Church of *England*. That's ſomewhat ſtrange. The *Roman* Catholick Lords have no *Chaplains*; The Law does not allow it. And as for the Diſſenters, there are very few Lords of their Perſwaſion. I deſire therefore to know upon what Party the Abuſe muſt ſtick? In earneſt, I'm almoſt tired with anſwering theſe things. To ſtrike the Air, does but make a Man's Arm ake.

There is a pretty long inſtance produced from the *Double Dealer*, to ſhew the Misbehaviour of the *Stage* towards the Clergy; theſe Paſſages he leaves to take their Fortune; for they have nothing in them it ſeems, which *needs a Defence*. This is a diſcreet way of anſwering; and I think, if he had made more uſe on't, it might have done as well.

P. 59.

To ſhew the Unreaſonableneſs of the Stage in repreſenting the Clergy under Characters of Diſadvantage and Contempt, I endeavoured to vindicate the Reputation of that *Order* from three Topicks.

1*ſt*. From their Relation to the Deity.

2*ly*. From the Importance of their Office.

3*ly*. Becauſe they had general Cuſtom, and Preſcription for their Privilege.

Under the firſt Head, I had ſaid that the *Credit of the Service always riſes in Proportion to the Quality and Greatneſs of the Maſter.*

View, &c. p. 127.

This

This Position, he says, is *sophistical*; and yet he is so civil as to grant it in the next line but one. However he makes a Stand at the Inference, and asserts, That *Though the Credit of the Service rises in proportion to the Quality of the Master, yet the Credit of the Servant, does not rise in proportion to the Credit of the Service.* Not rise in proportion to the Credit of the Service; that's strange! I thought Office and Authority had been a just ground for Regard; and that Honourable Charges had made Honourable Men. And if so, I suppose the Esteem of the Person must improve with the Credit of the Employment. I would gladly know in what Circumstance the Dignity of an Ambassadour consists? does it not lye in his Commission and Credentials, in the Advantage and Significancy of his Character? What makes such a Person treated with greater Regard, than a *Factor*, or private *Agent*; Is it not the Honour of the Representation, and the weight of the Business? Now he that executes for another, or represents him by way of Authority is without doubt in his Service: From whence follows, That if the Credit of the *Servant* rises by the Quality of the Business, and Authority, it must by consequence rise in proportion to the Credit of the Service; for these are only different words to signify the

Amend. p. 61.

Ibid.

same thing: Mr. *Congreve*'s saying, That *an ill Servant both discredits his Service, and is discredited by it*; is partly foreign, and partly false. To say he is discredited by it, is untrue. For 'tis the Misbehaviour, not the Office, which gives the Discredit. And then to say that an *ill Servant discredits his Service*, is nothing to his point. For the purpose. Suppose the Ministers of *State* or *Justice*, in any Government, should fail in their Conduct: Are they presently to be insulted by the Common People, exposed in the Badges of their Character, and made the Diversion of the Town? What if a Man is an ill Servant, his Commission ought to be his protection from private Indignities. As for his Mismanaging, he must account to his Master; Equals or Inferiors, have nothing to do to punish. Mr. *Congreve* adds, that *if a Servant is punish'd by the Law, the Honour of the Service is not by that means violated*. As much Law as he pleases; let Justice have its Course, and I'm contented. But what's this to the Stage? Have they a Patent of Jurisdiction over the Clergy? Are they authorised to pronounce upon their Faults, and their Punishment? To give them little behaviour, and contemptuous Usage; To make them Fools, and then treat them as such.

Amend. p. 61.

Amend. P. 62.

But

But now 'tis Mr. *Congreve*'s turn to ask Queſtions: He would know of me, *Whether a Man after he has received Holy Orders, is become incapable of either playing the Knave or the Fool?* Why truly, conſidering he has the ſame Humane Nature with a Poet, I can't think him utterly incapable of either. And now I may have anſwer'd his queſtion as civilly as he asked it. Amend. P. 63.

But if a Clergy-man plays the Fool, he is eqnally with a Lay-Fool, the ſubject of Laughter and Contempt. Not in the ſame way neither. Circumſtances alter any Caſe. Different Things require different Conſiderations. There are Laws, Diſcipline, and *Ordinaries*, to take care of greater Miſcarriages in the Church. And as for leſſer Misfortunes, they ſhould rather be lamented, than expos'd. The Clergy are a ſort of Spiritual Parents. St. *Paul*'s reaſoning ſuppoſes it: And the Church Catechiſm gives them an inference of Privilege from the Fifth Commandment. To banter a Relation of this kind, has neither Decency, nor Religion in't. And we know *Ham* got no Bleſſing by his Diſcovery. To ſtigmatize a ſolemn Character, to play the Buffoon in a Gown and Caſſock, and ſhew the Church for a *Monſter*, is, one would think, an odd diverſion in Chriſtendom. The Heathens treated the Primitive Chriſtians much at this Ibid.

rate: they wrapt Them in Bear-Skins, and then ſet the Dogs on them.

But Mr. *Congreve* urges, That by improper *Behaviour the Man becomes alienated from the Prieſt, and ſo the Folly is expos'd, not the Function.* For example if the Man be knock'd on the Head, the Prieſt is not a jot the worſe for't. This is much like the old Diſtinction of *Politic*, and *Perſonal Capacity*, applied to another Caſe. To give this Gentleman an Anſwer, more at large, he may pleaſe to take notice:

Ibid.

1*ſt*. Though the Function and the Perſon are ſeparable in Notion, they are join'd in Life and Buſineſs. 'Tis true, the Office and the Perſon are two Things; but yet 'tis the Perſon which executes the Office: This makes them ſhare a diſadvantage in Common; and a Cenſure frequently ſlides from the one to the other. If you make the Man a Knave, the Prieſt muſt ſuffer under the Imputation: And a Fool in his *Perſon*, will never be thought diſcreet in his Function. Upon this account Perſons in Authority whether Spiritual or Civil, ought to be privileg'd from Abuſe. To make the Miniſters of *Church* or *State*, the *ſubject of Laughter and Contempt*, diſables their Authority, and renders their Commiſſion inſignificant. The Heathen Dramatiſts ſeem ſenſible of this reaſoning, and practice accordingly.

See View, p. 122.

2*ly*. If

2*ly*. If the Poets design was no more than to *expose and reprehend Folly and Vice in general*, why are not the Failings of the Clergy represented in a Lay-Appearance? Why must the Satyr be pointed at the *Coat*, and run out into Reference and Distinction? Why must the Profession be dressed up, and the Folly keep all within the Function? Is not this plainly to confound the Order and the Miscarriage, to go off from the *Man* to the *Priest*, and render them both ridiculous?

3*ly*. Employments are oftentimes a shelter to Persons; and Characters a Protection from Insult: Publick Reason will not endure Authority to be expos'd, or the Magistrates to be made a *May-Game*. To Talk in Mr. *Congreve*'s Language, a *Lay-Fool* is not always to be saluted by his Folly. This would be great rudeness in Conversation; and the Government might suffer by it. Condition is a Cover for Failings. And Authority must not be a Jest. In this case a Man should be viewed on the side of Advantage, and treated by his best Distinction. Now if we consider the Author, And the Ends of Church Authority, we shall find it deserves a Guard, no less than that of the *State*.

The Church-Article quoted by Mr. *Congreve*, does him no Service. If it has any reference to the matter in hand, it makes

againſt him. The Article affirms, That *Evil Miniſters Act by Chriſt's Authority and Commiſſion*; That the *Word and Sacraments are ſignificant and Effectual in their Hands*; and that the Indiſpoſition of the *Agent*, do's not weaken the *Inſtitution*. Now ſince even a vicious Prieſt repreſents our Saviour, ſince he is God's Ambaſſadour, and is a Conveyance of the Bleſſings of Heaven: Theſe Credentials, theſe Benefits, one would think, might guard him from Contempt, and make his Character inviolable. 'Tis true, the Article ſays, They *may be accus'd, and being found guilty, by juſt Judgment depos'd.* But what of all this? Are the *Poets* their Judges? And is the Stage grown *Doctors Commons*, or *Weſtminſter-Hall?* Well: But the Article ſuppoſes a *Diſtinction between the Man, and the Prieſt.* Yes: And it ſuppoſes too, that the Man ought to fare the better for this double Capacity. Mr. *Congreve* in citing this Quotation, has miſtaken the Chronology, and confounded the *Articles* and *Canons*, but this I ſhall paſs over.

Amend. p. 67.

Amend. P. 64.

But Mr. *Congreve* falls into a worſe Miſtake than the former. He makes St. *Cyprian* affirm that the Validity of the *Sacraments* depends on the Probity of the Prieſt, and that the Article was partly *eſtabliſhed to take off the Authority of this Father.*

Ib. p. 66.

Now

Now to ſay this, is to miſreport St. *Cyprian*. 'Tis true, this worthy Prelate believ'd that a Prieſts Authority was ſuſpended by *Hereſy* and *Schiſm*; but that bare Immorality could recal his Commiſſion, he does no where ſuppoſe. The Caſe of the *Baſilides* & *Martialis*, if Mr. *Congreve* had produc'd it, would not come up to the Point: For this Inſtance concerns Sacrificing to Idols; which is an Act of Apoſtacy: It implies a renouncing of Chriſtianity. From whence it will follow, that thoſe who are not ſo much as Members of the Church, cannot have the Power of Church-Governours.

Mr. *Congreve* ſeems diſpleas'd with that little Juſtice I endeavoured to do the Clergy; and calls the Teſtimonies of the beſt *Poets*, *Orators*, *Hiſtorians*, &c. *Vain Stuff*. P. 71. *I take it* (ſays Mr. *Congreve*) *he would give us to underſtand, that in all Ages the Function of a Prieſt was held to be a very Honourable Function*; *Did Mr.* Collier *ever meet with any Body Fool enough to engage him to aſſert that?* Many a one, I can aſſure you, that have been either Fool or Knave enough, I can't tell which. If the Poſt is Honourable, the Perſons ſhould be conſider'd accordingly: They ſhould not be expoſed in a wretched Appearance; And have neither Sence nor Spirit nor fair uſage allowed them. The *Heathen Poets*, Ibid.

as

See View, &c. Ch. 3. as I prov'd at large, never ſerved their Prieſts ſo.

Amend. P. 71. 72. Mr. *Congreve* urges, that *Kings have been in all Ages expoſed and puniſh'd on the Stage, yet never any King complained of the* Theater *or the* Poets. From hence he argues, that if *Kings may be expoſed on the Stage*; Why not Prieſts? To this I anſwer,

1*ſt*. Mr. *Congreve*'s Argument ſuppoſes that *Poets* have the leave of *Princes* for this Freedom. Kings it ſeems are willing to be brought, and diſciplined on the Stage. Very well. But does the *Hierarchy* deſire to be repreſented? Does the Church give the *Play-Houſe* this Permiſſion? By no means. She complains of the Practice, and would have it otherwiſe. Now what Conſequence is there from Permiſſion to Remonſtrance, and from Pleaſure to Averſion? The Church does not deſire to be ſo Publick. Why ſhould ſhe be haled in, againſt her Inclination, and gaz'd on like a Malefactor?

2*ly*. Stage Princes are uſed agreeably to their Station: The Honour of their Function ſhines out in their Appearance. Their very Misfortunes are Majeſtick, and their Ruin Glorious. They are never repreſented Inſignificant, treated with Contempt, and Played the Fool with in *Comedy*. If they were thus uſed, I queſtion not but that the *Poets* and *Players* would quickly hear on't.

3*ly*.

3*ly*. If Princes were uſed as ill as Prieſts upon the Stage, they would not ſuffer ſo much by it. Princes are well guarded againſt Dramatick Out-rage. They have Power to puniſh and to oblige. The Magnificence of their Courts, the Pomp and Parade of their Figure, brighten their Authority, and preſerve a Regard. Theſe Circumſtances glitter upon the ſenſe, and ſtrike an awe upon the Spirits of the People. They refreſh their Character, and make them underſtood. They prevent the ſpreading of Fiction into Life, and keep a *Play-Houſe-Abuſe* from being acted in the Streets. In fine; Wealth and Power, tho' much ſhort of Princes, breaks the force of Inſolence, and is a Soveraign Remedy againſt Neglect. But the Clergy have no great ſhare of theſe Advantages; I mean generally ſpeaking, and with Us eſpecially. Their Proviſion is often ſlender, their Cenſures relate to another World, and they have nothing of Luſtre to affect the Imagination. A Condition thus unfortified, thus unornamented, lies open to ill uſage. The greater part of the Clergy are not ſo well provided to diſprove an unfair Repreſentation. They can't ſo eaſily confute a Calumny by their Equipage, nor make their Fortune put a Lye out of Countenance. To be taken notice of, Things muſt

ſhine

ſhine as well as be ſolid; a Coarſe out-ſide keeps the Richneſs within from being regarded. Spiritual Privilege, and inviſible Advantage ſignifie little with Ignorance, or Atheiſm. When a Man can ſcarce hold his Head above Water, there needs no great Weight to ſink him. Misfortune in ſuch an Age as this, is almoſt a jeſt of it ſelf. A little Buffooning is ſufficient to make Indigence look ridiculous; for when a Man's Coat is thread-bare, 'tis an eaſie matter to pick a hole in't.

vid. S. *Auguſt.* De Civ. Dei Plin. pan. Dio. Jul. Capitol. Hiſt. Auguſt. p. 27. Tacit. Annal vid. Serres Hiſt. Goſſon.

4*ly*. His pretence of Matter of Fact is not true. Princes *have complain'd of the Theatre*. The great *Scipio* pull'd it down; *Trajan* & *Antoninus Philoſophus* diſcourag'd *Plays*, and *Tiberius* Baniſhed the Stage. To come nearer Home, *Lewis* the Godly would not endure a *Play-Houſe*, and Queen *Elizabeth* often chek't this ſort of Diverſion. Now theſe were moſt of them *Great Princes*, and which is more to the purpoſe, moſt of them good ones too.

Mr. *Congreve* ſeems now fallen into a fit of Levelling. Quality and Secular advantage, are grown *Bells*, and *Baubles*. In his Logick, Honour and Eſtate, are Inconſiſtent with *Humility and other Chriſtian Virtues. Such Temporal Pride he pretends agrees very ill with the Perſon and Character of a truly Pious and Exemplary Divine*. Had this

P. 73.

Ibid.

Gen-

Gentleman the Direction of Affairs, 'tis likely the World would be well mended, the Church Reformed into Apoſtolical Poverty, And all theſe *Antichriſtian* Things *of* Fortune and Convenience, taken from the *Exemplary Divines*, and given to the *Exemplary Poets*.

Mr. *Congreve* comes on again reinforced with Mr. *Hales*, who proves from Scripture that all "claim to ſuperiority by Title of "*Chriſtianity* is moſt certainly cut off. With ſubmiſſion to Mr. *Hales*, this is not univerſally true. For the Church being a *Society*, muſt by conſequence have Governours, and theſe by the ſame Neceſſity, muſt in that reſpect be ſuperiour to the Governed. For this reaſon, the Apoſtle, ſpeaking to private Chriſtians, Enjoyns them in theſe words, *Obey them that have the Rule over you, and ſubmit your ſelves; for they watch for your Souls*, &c. This Text we ſee plainly contains a branch of Duty to *Eccleſiaſtical* Governours. Now thoſe *who have the Rule over others*, are certainly ſo far their Superiors; And thoſe who are to *ſubmit themſelves*, are bound to acknowledge them as ſuch. To go on with Mr. *Congreve*'s Citation. "Nature and Religion "agree in this, that neither of them has a "hand in this *Heraldry* of *ſecundum ſub &* "*ſupra*; all this comes from Compoſition "and

Amend. p. 74.

Heb. 13. 17.

Ibid. "and Agreement of Men among themſelves. Here Mr. *Hales* is miſtaken again; For Parents have by Nature a Right of Superiority over their Children. I grant Mr. *Hales*'s Principle holds true in the Main; but nothing can be more extravagant than Mr. *Congreve*'s Inference. Does this Gentleman mean that there's no ſuch thing as Superiority amongſt Chriſtians? Is ſubordination deſtroyed by Baptiſm? Does Chriſtianity confound all Degrees, and melt down all Diſtinction in the *State*; This Doctrine is calculated for the Meridian of *Munſter*, for the *Boars* of *Germany*, for *John* of *Leyden* and *Knipperdolling*: *Jack Straw* and *Wat Tyler*, *Cade* and *Ket* would have been wonderfully obliged at ſuch a Diſcovery as this. But if Civil Privileges are conſiſtent with Chriſtianity, I hope the Clergy may plead their Right in Common, and take the Advantage of the *Conſtitution* like other People.

Sleidan. Com.

View, &c. p. 136. I had ſaid, The *Addition of Clerk is at leaſt equal to that of Gentleman; were it otherwiſe, the Profeſſion would in many caſes be a kind of puniſhment.* I ſay ſo ſtill. For if a Gentleman was made leſs, and degraded by going into *Orders*, would it not be a kind of Puniſhment? Can any thing be plainer than this? I can't imagine how Mr. *Congreve* could miſinterpret this Period.

riod. But ſince he has done it, he would do well to call in his exclamation, and wonder at his own Ignorance or Inſincerity. P. 75.

I obſerv'd, that *Monſieur Racine*, contrary to the practice of foreign Countries, repreſented Prieſts in his *Athalia*. I obſerv'd farther, That this *Play was a very Religious Poem. And if it were not deſign'd for the Theater, I have nothing to object.* My meaning is, if it were deſign'd for the Theater, I thought the Form and Argument too ſolemn for the Place. But that it was deſign'd for the *Theater*, is more than I know; and I rather believe it was not. It being not uncommon in *France* and elſewhere, to act ſerious and inoffenſive *Plays* in *Religious Houſes*. Had Mr. *Congreve* underſtood this, or indeed the plain Engliſh of the Words, all his Cavilling and awkard Jeſts had been at an end. The *Short View*, &c. takes notice that *Shakeſpear*, though to blame, was a Genteeler Enemy than the *Relapſer*; Why ſo? Becauſe he gives Sir *John*, Parſon of *Wrotham*, *ſome Advantage in his Character, he repreſents him Lewd, but not Little*. Here Mr. *Congreve* is extreamly diverting. The BUT (ſays he) *is coming again. I had a glimpſe of him juſt now*. Beſt of all; 'Tis more than he has of himſelf, ſometimes. Lewd but not Little, there's a Paradox for ye! Well, I grant View, &c. P. 124. P. 125. Amend. p. 74.

ſome

ſome People are both. However, there's room enough between theſe Qualities for a Diſtinction. For I ſuppoſe a Man may be Lewd in his Practice, without being Little in his Figure and Behaviour. Does every Libertine wear a *Livery*, or is Lewdneſs a forfeiture of Condition? In a ſenſe of Philoſophy and Religion, there's nothing meaner than Vice: But then the Advantage of Appearance is ſome Cover for the Deformity, and gives it another Air to Common View.

Mr. *Congreve* allows, That when *Men neither Sneak, nor do any thing unbecoming their Office in the World, they ought not to be repreſented otherwiſe on the Stage.* Were the Heathen Prieſts then ſo abſolutely unexceptionable? Were there no Prevarications amongſt them? and did they never Live out of their Character? Mr. *Congreve* can't think this: And yet as I obſerved, they were always well treated by the Heathen Poets. But beſides, what occurs in this *Anſwer*, I have given him my reaſons elſewhere, why the Clergy ought in no Caſe to come upon the Stage.

P. 77.

View, &c. p. 122.

View, &c.

Mr. *Congreve* is ſo kind as to inform me, that *I talk in the Pedantical Cant of Fable, Intreague, Diſcovery, of Unities of Time*, &c. He means the *Pedantical Cant* of *Ariſtotle* and *Horace*, of *Boſſu* and *Corneille*, of *Rapin*, and

p. 82.

and Mr. *Dryden*; that is of the beſt Criticks, both Antient and Modern, upon the Subject. This is ſomewhat ſtrange! But I perceive the Man is wildred in his Spleen: He loſt himſelf in a miſt of his own making, And when people can't ſee, they are apt to fall foul upon their Friends.

He finds fault with ſome more expreſſions of mine, how reaſonably, I ſhall conſider by and by. p. 84.

Mr. *Congreve* having ſpent ſome Pages in Trifling and Scurrility, advances to my 4*th.* Chapter. This *Chapter* charges the *Stage* with Immorality for rewarding their looſe Characters, and giving their Libertines ſuch Advantage in Figure, Senſe and Succeſs. Mr. *Congreve* knew the *Old Batchelour* and *Double Dealer* concern'd under this Head, but takes no notice of it. 'Tis true, he makes an attempt to diſengage *Valentine* in *Love for Love*. He would gladly Blanch this foul Character; But alas, 'tis to no purpoſe to waſh and rub: The Spots are not Dirt, but Complection. He ſays *Valentine had honeſty enough to cloſe with a bad Bargain, rather then not pay his Debts.* Thus Mr. *Congreve*. But if we will take *Valentine*'s word for't, we ſhall find the matter otherwiſe. 'Twas his Neceſſity, his diſreliſh of Confinement, his Paſſion

View, &c. P. 142. Amend. P. 88.

for *Angelica*, which put him upon this Complyance. Let him ſpeak for himſelf.

L. for L. P. 8. 16.

Val. *This Condition was once propoſed before and I refuſed it, but the preſent impatience of my Creditors for their Money, and my own impatience of Confinement, and abſence from* Angelica, *force me to conſent.*

So much for his Honeſty. And that he is Debauch'd, Profane and Smutty, Unnatural to his Son, and Undutiful to his Father, I ſtill affirm, and appeal for Evidence to the Pages of the Citation.

View, &c. p. 142.

p. 41. 35. Amend. p. 90, 92.

Mr. *Congreve* endeavours to juſtifie *Bellmour* and *Sharper*, in the *Old Batchelour*, againſt my exceptions. But here according to his uſual fair dealing he miſreports the Caſe. He tells the *Reader* I produc'd theſe Paſſages to prove him guilty of *encouraging Immorality*. But this is quite miſtaking the Matter. Theſe Paſſages among others were produced to ſhew how roughly the *Women* were treated by the *Stage*: That their fine Characters were unceremonious, and fail'd in the Decencies of a *Cavalier*.

p. 92.

See View, &c. p. 165. 170, 171, 172.

Amend. P. 91.

He is glad *I can prevail with my ſelf to write the Helliſh Syllable* [POX] *at length*; I could not do ſo in Page 82 of my Book. Right. And I had ſome Reaſon for my Scruple. For I conceive there's ſome difference between the naming a Blaſphemous Curſe, and the Foul Diſeaſe. The

Word

Word was uſed the former way when I declin'd to tranſcrib'd it.

I have aſſaulted the Town, it ſeems, *in the ſeat of their principal and moſt reaſonable Pleaſure.* I am ſorry to hear the encouraging of Vice, the Liberties of Smut and Profaneneſs, the expoſing of Holy Things and Perſons, are ſuch lively ſatisfactions. The Palate muſt be ſtrangely vitiated to reliſh ſuch Entertainment as this. I would gladly believe the *Stage* has not yet ſubdued the Underſtandings of the *Audience*, nor debauch'd their Reaſon to this Degree. I hope the *Town* is miſreported in ſome meaſure, and that as to the choice and value of Pleaſure, the *Pſalmiſt*'s Authority may be better than Mr. *Congreve*'s, *Bleſſed is the Man that ſtands not in the way of Sinners, nor ſits in the Seat of the ſcornful. But his delight is in the Law of the Lord.* P. 103. Pſ. 1. 1, 2.

Mr. *Congreve* pretends the *Invectives of the Fathers were levelled at the Cruelty of the* Gladiators, *and the Obſcenity of the* Pantomimes. *If ſome of them*, continues he, *have confounded the* Drama *with ſuch Spectacles, it was an overſight of Zeal very alowable in thoſe Days; and in the Infancy of Chriſtianity, when the Religion of the* Heathens *was intermingled with their* Poetry *and Theatral Repreſentations.* The Fathers Cenſure P. 105.

of the *Stage*, of which I gave many Inſtances, *was an overſight of Zeal*! Their Heat ran away with their Judgment, and to make them ſafe, we muſt read them with Mr. *Congreve*'s Comment. And yet this *overſight of Zeal* is forgotten, and their Conduct juſtified by our Author immediately after. For as the Caſe then ſtood, he ſays, *the beſt of the Heathen Plays might very well be forbidden*. But theſe Reſtraints, it ſeems were put upon *the Infancy of Chriſtianity*. Under favour, *Chriſtianity* was no *gradual Religion*: 'Twas like *Adam* at its full growth at firſt. If weakneſs, if obſtinacy, and perverſneſs, are ſigns of *Infancy*, we are much more in the ſtate of the *Cradle* now. As for the concern of the *Heathen Religion*, that was not the only Objection the *Fathers* had to the *Stage*: They likewiſe declaimed againſt the Lewdneſs and Immorality of thoſe Diverſions. This I have ſhewn ſufficiently in the Teſtimonies Cited from them: And likewiſe proved the Cenſure of the *Fathers* applicable to the *Engliſh Theatre*.

Ibid.

View, &c. P. 276. deinc.

Mr. *Congreve* would gladly throw his own Talent of unfair Citing and miſapplying upon me. But has not been able to prove it in one Inſtance, excepting that miſtake of *Waſting* for *Wafting* mention'd before.

Amend. P. 105.

p. 106, 107.

His

His Story out of *Polybius* will do him no kindneſs; for, as I have obſerved already, there is no arguing from *Heatheniſm* to *Chriſtianity*. Ignorance when not affected, goes a great way in an excuſe. *Polybius* was a wiſe Man, but he was a Pagan, and lived too early to know any thing of our Religion. In ſhort, either the *Theatral Performances* of the *Cynethians* were innocent, or they were not. If they were not, to what purpoſe are they mentioned: If they were, our Stage is no *parallel* to them. There being very few modern *Plays* in which there is not ſomething exceptionable: Either Curſing or Swearing, vain invocation of the Name of God, Ribaldry, or Profaneneſs; or elſe ſome fooliſh or deſtructive Paſſion made Creditable and Charming. And as for the Bulk of his Author *Polybius*, I ſuppoſe *Scipio Naſica*, *Scævola*, and St. *Auguſtin*, were all of them as great Men as He. I ſhall give him counter-Evidence from them. This Father informs us, that *Scævola* who was *Pontifex Maximus*, and one of the Senate, *diſſuaded that noble Aſſembly from going on with the Building of a Theatre*. He told them in a ſet Speech, *That this Diverſion would bring in Foreign Vice; and the Debaucheries of* Greece *among them. That the old* Roman *Virtue would be loſt, and the Spirits of the*

S. Aug. de Civ. Dei. lib. 1. cap. 31.

People emaſculated. This Harangue governed the *Senate*, and ſtopt tht Progreſs of the *Stage* for that time. This Teſtimony St. *Auguſtin* mentions with Approbation. And in the next Chapter but one, He calls
cap. 33. theſe *Theatral Performances, animorum labem & peſtem, probitatis & honeſtatis everſionem*, i, e. *The Blemiſhes of Human Nature, the Plague of Reaſon, and the Ruine of Virtue:* And adds, *That* Scipio *foreſeeing theſe mortal conſequences, hindred the building of* Play-Houſes. *He did not think the Government could ſubſiſt upon the ſtrength of Brick and Stone. But that Diſcipline and good Manners were to be taken care of no leſs than the Fortification of the City.*

To the Authority of this Father I ſhall Subjoin that of *Horace*, who in his Book *de Arte Poetica*, Mentioning the *Roman* Theatre before his own Time, has theſe words

Quo ſane populus numerabilis utpote parvus.
Et frugi, Caſtusq; verecundusq; coibat.

'Tis very remarkable ſays *Monſieur Dacier*, that *Horace* ſhould commend the old *Romans* for not frequenting the *Theatre*. He gives four Reaſons for the little Inclination they had for theſe Diverſions. "They were not very Numerous; They "were Wiſe; They were Religious; And "they were Modeſt.

Dacier. Remarq. ſur L'Art Poetique Vol. 10. P. 238.

The

The three laſt Reaſons are ſtrongly to our point, and the ſtronger for coming from a *Poet*. This was ſo plain, and ſo conſiderable an acknowledgment, that Mr. *Dacier* makes the following *Marginal* Note upon it. *The Theatre Condemned as inconſiſtent with Prudence and Religion.* Ibid. Vol. 10. p. 37.

As for innocent Diverſions, I have nothing to ſay againſt them. But I think People ſhould take care not to relieve their Spirits at the expence of their Virtue, not to Cure *Melancholly* with Madneſs, and ſhake of their Spleen, and their Reaſon together. Mr. *Goſſon* a Stage Poet in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time ſays much the ſame thing, only the expreſſion is ſomewhat ſtronger. In his Addreſs to the *Gentlewomen* of *London*, he has theſe words: *Being penſive at Home, if you go to the Theaters to drive away Fancies, it is as good Phyſick, as for the Ache of your Head, to knock out your Brains; or when you are Stung with a Waſp, to rub the Sore with a Nettle.* See Goſ.'s School of Abuſe.

The ſame Author is ſo Frank as to declare, That *Eaſe and Idleneſs bring Deſtruction*; and that *Pleaſure & Sport are the Devil's Baits*; That *honeſt Recreation quickens the Spirits, but Plays are venemous Arrows to the Mind. When Comedy comes upon the Stage*, Cupid *ſets up a Springe for Woodcocks, which are entangled e're they diſcern the Line, and caught before they miſtruſt the Snare.*

Apol. of the School of Abuſe, p. 88, 89.

And a little before, *We call that a Slaughter Houſe where brute Beaſts are kill'd, and hold that a Paſtime which is the very Butchery of Chriſtian Souls.*

P. 108.

Mr. *Congreve* argues at laſt from the diſadvantage of the *Globe*, and the *uncertainty of our Climate*. Now I'm afraid theſe Geographical Reaſons are no better than the reſt. I doubt this Expedient of a *Play-Houſe* won't make the *Latitude* one jot the better. 'Twill ne're fix the floating of our Humours, nor bring us to the ſteddineſs of the *Continent*. To ſpeak ſoftly What is there more likely to awaken our Paſſions than theſe Diverſions, and to fill us with Freaks and Fancies, and extravagant Amuſement? Now when Paſſions runs high, Diſappointment riſes with them; and good Humour grows more precarious. For the more we are diſappointed, the more *dark*, and *Saturnine*, and *Melancholick* we ſhall certainly be. The Reſignation of Chriſtians, and the Pleaſures of Reaſon and the Satisfaction of living to ſome purpoſe, are by much, the beſt Remedies againſt Melancholly. But *are not we of all*

P. 109.

People the moſt unfit to be alone? The *French* Proverb ſhall anſwer this: *Better be alone, than in ill Company.* Mr. *Congreve* goes on in his Panegyrick upon his Country: *Are there not more Self-Murtherers, and Melancholick*

cholick Lunaticks in England, *heard of in one year, than in a great part of* Europe *beſides.* Ibid.

Tho' I ſomewhat queſtion the Truth, as well as the Civility of this Reflection; but if 'tis true, 'tis probable the *Play-Houſe* may in ſome Meaſure account for the *Fact*. If there are more Self-Murthers and Lunacies in *England* than elſewhere, 'tis probably, becauſe there are more bad Plays in *England than in a great part of* Europe *beſides*: I believe I may ſay, than in all *Europe* beſides. When Paſſions are rais'd, and Principles deſtroy'd, ſome People can neither keep their Wits, nor their Lives long together. They grow impatient of this World, and Fooliſh enough to ruſh blindly upon the other. *Love* and *Pride* are obſerved to ſtock *Bedlam*. Now theſe two Paſſions are work'd up to the higeſt Exceſs in *Plays*. A Spark is ſcarce thought Civil to his Miſtreſs, unleſs he's ready to run Mad for her. And as for Pride, 'tis no leſs ſtrongly recommended under the Notion of Glory, Greatneſs, and Revenge. Indeed the *Play-Houſe* is a ſort of Nurſery to a Mad Houſe: 'Tis not long ſince one of them was ſent thither; and I rather wonder they are not oftner tranſplanted. I am ſorry for any Man's Misfortune; and 'tis only Mr. *Congreve*'s Argument which draws the Inſtance from me. He is now come

p. 109. come to his laſt Queſtion. *From whence are all our Sects, Schiſms, and innumerable ſubdiviſions in Religion?* Let them come from whence they will, we had better have them than ſome Peoples Remedies. 'Tis much ſafer to be of different Opinions, than agree in believing nothing. Atheiſm is an ill Cure of Hereſy and Schiſm: I admire Uniformity in Doctrine extreamly; but ſtill I muſt crave leave to believe, that a miſtaken Conſcience is more ſerviceable than no Conſcience at all.

Mr. *Congreve* concludes his Book with an unfair Quotation about Muſick. He underſtands the Art of Miſrepreſenting, and leaves out a ſignificant *word*, very handſomly for that purpoſe. But I ſhall paſs it over; and come to his Criticiſms upon ſome of my Expreſſions.

P. 84. The *Ladies fancy Slip-ſtocking high*, with which he quarels, is an Alluſion to a known Story, in a Book very well known. To deal freely, I made bold with it to prevent its falling into the Enemies Hand. *A whole Kennel of Beaus after a Woman*, is no Language of mine: 'Tis a Quotation from the *Relapſe*; As Mr. *Congreve* might eaſily have ſeen. *Running Riot upon Smut*, is miſquoted. My words are theſe: "The "*Double Dealer* runs Riot upon ſuch an "occaſion as this, and gives Lord *Touch-*

"*wood*

Echard's Reaſons of the Con. of the Clergy. Ibid.

See View, &c. p. 225. Relapſe, p. 64. View, &c. p. 27.

"*wood* a mixture of *Smut*, &c. *The upper End of the Government*, is a defenſible Expreſſion; And his Exception to the *Litter of Epithets*, &c. I have anſwered already. His Objections at *Big-Allyances*, is ſomewhat unfairly tranſcrib'd, and the Page miſmark'd. The Paſſage is this: "*Jehoi-*
"*da* was thought an Allyance big enough for the Royal Family. He Cavils at two other little words, which I think may paſs: But I ſhall ſay nothing in their behalf. To defend ſuch Trifles, would be almoſt as idle, as to object againſt them. View, &c. p. 130.

Now though I have examined Mr. *Congreve*'s Writings but looſely upon this Head, yet in return to his Civilities, I ſhall preſent the Reader with ſome Proprieties of His in Phraſeology and Senſe. p. 11. In his Amendments we have, To *Savour of Utterance*, &c. And in the *Mourning Bride*, we have all the Delicacies of Language and Rhetorick, and the very Spring it ſelf upon Paper. Here's *Reſpiring Lips*, *ample Roof, and ample Knowledge, the Noon of Night, fear'd*, for frighted, the *pageantry of Souls*, *Eyes rain Blood*, and what not. To go on a little with the *Mourning Bride*, with reference to Senſe and Character. P. 3. 79. MournB. P. 24, 64, 61, 57, 14. p. 8.

King *Manuell* asks his Daughter *Almeria*, why ſhe wears Mourning at his Triumph. She tells him, *She mourns for her deliverance*

liverance from a Wreck. This was a wise Answer, and a very natural way of expressing her Gratitude for coming safe on Shore.

Gonsalez relates *Manuel*'s Victorious Entry after his Success against the Moors. The Cavalcade is wonderfully Splendid and Pompuous: But the Story goes off somewhat unluckily.

P. 7. *The swarming Populace spread every Wall,*
And cling as if with Claws they did enforce
Their Hold through clifted Stones stretching
and staring.

Here he Struts to purpose in *Sophocles*'s Buskings! *Cling* and *Claws* are extreamly magnificent in solemn Description, and strangely proper for Tragedy and Triumph. To give him his due, I think these two Lines are the best Image of a parcel of Cats running up a Wall, that I have met with. That which follows is worth the remembring.

Ibid. *As they were all of Eyes and every Limb,*
Would feed his Faculty of Admiration.

A Limb of an Eye, I confess, is a great Curiosity; And one would think if the *Poet* had any of these Limbs in his Head, he might have discover'd it. We must not forget *Osmin*'s Talent in Arithmetick, who let us understand that

Heaven

Heaven can continue to beſtow, p. 21.
When ſcanty Numbers ſhall be ſpent in telling.

As Scanty as they are, I *fancy Telling* will be ſpent much ſooner than *Numbers:* But Senſe in a Tragedy is cold and unaffecting. To go on. *Zarah* makes *Oſmin* a high Compliment upon his Air and Complexion: She tells him when ſhe firſt ſaw him,

Pale and expiring, drenched in briny Waves, p. 23. 24.

That he was
God-like even then.

Death and Paleneſs are ſtrong Reſemblances of a Deity! But I perceive, to ſome People, a Seraphim, and a drown'd Rat, are juſt alike. King *Manuell* is giving Sentence upon the Rebels: Let us ſee how he ſupports his Character:

Bear to the Dungeon thoſe Rebellious Slaves, P. 41.
The ignoble Curs that Yelp to fill the Cry,
And ſpend their Mouths in barking Tyranny.

And a little after, he calls the Noble *Oſmin, that foreign Dog.* Here's Majeſtick Paſſion, Royal Vengeance, and magnificent Railing for ye! A Common Hunt could not have done it better! This, as Mr. *Congreve* has it, is *Dog-Language* with a Witneſs; and never made for a Monarch's Mouth. Amend. p. 28.

Zara

Zara has another Flight very remarkable, and with that I ſhall conclude. This Princeſs, we muſt know, was ſtrangely ſmitten with *Oſmin*, and finding her Amour croſs'd, was reſolv'd, out of ſtark Love and Kindneſs, to Poiſon him: 'Tis true, ſhe intended to be ſo juſt, as to diſpoſe of her ſelf the ſame way. Now coming to the Priſon ſhe ſpies a Body without a Head, and imagining it *Oſmin*'s, grows diſtracted upon't. And why ſo? Was it becauſe ſhe was prevented, and had not the ſatisfaction of diſpatching her Spark her ſelf? Or was it becauſe ſhe had a mind to convince *Oſmin* of the ſtrength of her Affection by murthering him? That's ſomewhat odd. Was it then to ſhew how willing ſhe was to dye with him? She ſays ſo; but preſently rejects this reaſon as frivolous and unneceſſary. For if you'll believe her, *Oſmin* was capable of knowing her Paſſion, without ſo barbarous an Expedient.

P. 63. *His Soul ſtill ſees, and knows each purpoſe,*
And fixt event of my perſiſting Faith.

Well, Let the reaſon of her Diſorder be what it will, for we can't agree about it, ſhe falls into a moſt terrible Fit of Fuſtian, upon the ſight of the Body.

Ha!

Ha! proſtrate! bloody! headleſs! O,---ſtart Eyes, p. 62.
Split heart, burſt every Vein at this dire object;
At once diſſolve and flow; meet Blood with Blood,
Daſh your encountring Streams with mutual Violence,
Till Surges roll, and foaming Billows riſe,
And curle their Crimſon Heads to kiſs the Clouds!

One would think by this Rant, that *Zara* had Bloud enough in her Veins to fill the *Bay* of *Biſcay*, or the Gulph of *Lions*. At this rate a Man may let the *Thames* out of his little Finger! This is monſtrous Impropriety of Thought! Never were Things and Words, joyn'd more unluckily. Call you this Poetry! The Figures and Flights of Poetry are Bold; but then the Fancy ſhould be Natural, the Figures Juſt, and the Effects holds ſome proportion with the Cauſe. *Zara* riſes in her Rumbling, if 'tis poſſible, rails bitterly on the King, in *Aſtronomy*; And, as far as I can diſcover, ſhe goes ſomewhat upon the Syſtem of *Copernicus*.

Rain, rain, ye Stars ſpout from your burning
Precipitated Fires, and pour in Sheets, [*Orbs,* p. 62.
The blazing Torrent on the Tyrant's Head.

Well. Tho' this Lady has not much Wit in her Anger, ſhe has a great deal of Learning:

ning: I muſt own, this is a very Scholar-like piece of Diſtraction. If Mr. *Congreve* replies, the Occaſion was extraodinary; and that the ſight of *Oſmin*'s Murther muſt mightily affect her. Granting all this, the old ſaying will hold good againſt him: *Curæ leves loquuntur, ingentes ſtupent*: Here *Almeria*'s Fit of Fainting, and a good Swoon at the end on't, would have look'd like Buſineſs, and been very natural upon the occaſion. I could have been ſomewhat larger upon the *Mourning Bride*, but this may ſuffice at preſent.

I charged Mr. *Congreve* with two very Lewd and Scandalous Songs; but theſe he paſſes over unmention'd. This is ſomewhat unfortunate: One would have thought, if he had neither Modeſty to make them, nor Reaſon to defend them, he might, at leaſt, have had a little Conſcience to have given them up.

View. &c. p. 24. 25. L. for Lo. Lov. Triumph. p. 73.

A Reply

A

REPLY

TO THE

Short Vindication

OF THE

Relapſe and the *Provok'd-Wife.*

THIS Author pretends I had little to charge him with upon the Subject of Immodeſty, that *I come to no particulars*, but only mention *Miſs Hoyden with others for an Immodeſt Character.* By his Favour, I am particular in the matter objected, and ſince he calls for it, I ſhall direct the *Reader* to ſome more Decencies of this Young Lady. To deny Matter of Fact in the beginning of a Vindication is a little unlucky!

Vindic. P. 7.

View, &c. P. 221. Relap. p. 60, 62, 63.

This Gentleman is at *a Loſs what I mean by Immodeſty, he knows of no Smut talk'd by* Miſs Hoyden; and makes the Fault mine to underſtand him in that ſenſe. Here's a flight of In-

Ibid.

nocence for ye! One would think his Capacity was bound up to Virtue in an extraordinary manner; And that the bare Notion of Ill could not get into his Head. By the way, I am ſorry to find him thus Undiſtinguiſhing. This Ignorance in a *Stage-Poet* does not look well. Cuſtomary Swearing takes away the ſenſe of doing it, and I am afraid it may be applicable to other matters. The *Vindicator* and his Brethren have an admirable way of defending themſelves from Indecencies. If you detect them, they tell you 'tis your own Conſtruction, *and you may take it for your pains.* As if the Knowledge of Good and Evil, was Criminal; and to ſhow one Fault, was to make another. It ſeems then the Deformity of Matters lies in the *Organ*, not in the Object, in the Idea not in the Thing. A Man had much better go into a Puddle than diſcover it. He that ſees an Ulcer, or perceives an offenſive Smell, is extreamly to blame in his Senſes! The *Vindicator* impoſes on the *Reader* by affirming himſelf *concern'd only in one Quotation more* in my Chapter of *Immodeſty*. For

Ibid.

View, &c. P. 219, 220.

1. The general Reference may imply more. And beſides, if it did not, I have given more Inſtances in *Loveleſs* and *Berinthia*, on the ſame Head tho' not in the ſame *Chapter*. There are likewiſe more lewd Paſſages in his two *Plays* heighten'd with Irreligion; but theſe ſhall be Poſtpon'd a little.

Relapſe, P. 47, 51, 73, 74.

I ſhall now examine his Defence of a quotation from the *Provok'd-Wife*. The Dialogue lies between Lady *Brute* and *Belinda*. *Belinda* ſays, *Why don't ſome Reformer or other beat the Poet for Smuttineſs?* *L.* Brute,

P. 41.

L. Brute, *Becauſe he is not ſo ſure of our Private Approbation; as of our Publick Thanks. Well; ſure there is not upon Earth, ſo impertinent a thing as Womens Modeſty.*

Belind. *Yes, Mens Fantaſque that obliges us to it. If we quit our Modeſty, they ſay we looſe our Charms.* (There's his Defence.) *And yet they know that very Modeſty is Affectation, and rail at our Hypocriſy.* Here's admirable encouragement for Virtue! The Ladies make a Grieveance of Modeſty, And declare it the moſt impertinent thing in Nature. Ay, but what do the Men ſay? Why they ſay 'tis all Affectation and Hypocriſie. and are not theſe charming Qualities upon the Diſcovery? A pretence ſeen through is wonderfully engaging! The *Vindicator* confeſſes as much. He ſays the Men rail at the Women for their Modeſty. I can't ſee, how they ſhould do otherwiſe, if they believe it nothiug but Grimace. Here's a handſome Complement upon the Women. They are brought in guilty by both *Sexes*. They can't be ſincere it ſeems without appearing Vitious, nor deal clearly without Impudence, nor be Honeſt without playing the Whore! But over and above the *Poet's* Courtſhip; theſe are Powerful Motives to Modeſty! What Woman would not be in Love with it upon this Deſcription? The Credit of Affectation is ſtrangely tranſporting, who would not take pains to be counted a Hypocrite? There's nothing of Complexion in Modeſty: 'Tis only a little Paint laid on with a Trowel. It neither ſits eaſie, nor looks natural: 'Tis fooliſh to themſelves,

ſelves, and formal to other People: And now what Woman would not ſtrive hard for ſuch an accompliſhment as this? But on the other ſide, this is a comfortable Scheme for the *Town Sparks*. To ſpeak in our Author's Military way. What Libertine would not preſs the Siege, and be at the trouble of a little Storming, when he has Intelligence of a Party *within*; when he believes the *Bloody-Colours* falſe, and that there's Friendſhip in the very Defiance? Now had I not upon this Occaſion ſome reaſon to obſerve that Modeſty was out of Faſhion with our *Stage*, and the *Bank* much ſunk ſince the time of *Euripides*, I ſay ſince the time of *Euripides*; For his Ladies always converſe with all the Decency and Reſervedneſs imaginable. They declare againſt intemperate Talk, and love Virtue both in the Thing and in the Appearance.

I had ranged the *Profaneneſs* of the *Stage* under two Heads.

1. *Their Curſing and Swearing*,
2. *Their Abuſe of Religion and Holy Scriptures*.

Upon the Head of *Swearing*, I obſerv'd the *Relapſe* and the *Provok'd Wife*, *were particularly Rampant and Scandalous*. This, the *Vindicator* ſays, was done with a great deal of *Honeſty* and *Charity*. So 'twas. To report fairly, and tell People of their Faults, is very conſiſtent with both thoſe Qualities. He goes on, and jeſts a little about *Bullys* and *Hackney-Coach-Men*, and by the Gayety of his Humour, you would think him extreamly Innocent. But after all this unconcernedneſs,

Vin. p. 11.

if

if his Crime ſhould not be little, I am afraid his Conſcience will appear ſo. However he complains he is mightily overcharged; and that *all the ſtretch of the Prophaneneſs lies in* Ld. Foppington's *Gad*, *and* Miſs Hoyden's *I-Cod*. Now *Hoyden*'s Expreſſion I take to be rank *Swearing*, neither does he deny it. And as for Ld. *Foppington*, he adds *By*, to *Gad*; which in his particular way of Pronouncing *o*, like *a*, is broad and downright. This Gentleman would excuſe himſelf by the Liberties of Converſation, and gives ſeveral Inſtances of diſguiſed Oaths. What means he by inſiſting ſo much upon Precedent? Does Cuſtom juſtifie a Fault? Is Sin improved into Privilege? And can a Man *Swear* by *Common-Law*? Beſides all the Inſtances mentioned excepting *Par Die*, are leſs Criminal than his own. And were it otherwiſe, no ſort of Profananeſs is fit for Repreſentation; as I have proved ſufficiently already. This Author complains, *my Accuſations againſt him almoſt always run in general Terms*, &c. Well. If a Liſt of particulars will oblige him, he ſhall have it. I did not take this Method for want of Evidence, I can aſſure him. The petty Oaths and Curſes (as I ſuppoſe the *Poets* think them) together with the vain Invocation of the Name of God, I ſhall omit; To tranſcribe or point to them, would be tedious. But as for thoſe of a blacker Complection, tho they muſt not be produced, the *Reader* may ſee them if he pleaſes: And then he may judge if I have done the Vindicator any wrong by pronouncing them *Rampant* and *Scandalous*.

Vin. p. 11.

View, &c. P. 96. An. *Cong.* vid. 3d. Poſt.

P. 10.

Relap. p. 7, 9, 11, 13, 28, 32 33, 43, 44, 55, 61, 62, 65, 66, 74, 75, 77, 78, 81, 87, 101, 102, 103, 105. Pro. Wife p. 20, 27, 36, 37, 39, 76.

In the *Relapſe* this horrible Rhetorick is ſpoken by Ld. *Foppington*, *Young Faſhion*, *Seringe*, *Coupler*, and *Miſs Hoyden*. To theſe we muſt add *Juſtice Tunbelly*, who to make himſelf the better Magiſtrate, ſwears like a *Bully* with open Mouth. The *Provok'd Wife* is little better. Sir *John* and the *Colonel* Swear with a great deal of Reliſh and Noiſe; and *Conſtant* is not overſtanch. Some of theſe Pages have double Charges, and ſo have ſome in the *Relapſe*. Curſing and *Fiends* Language, is likewiſe very frequent in the *Provok'd Wife*. Now, tho Oaths are not, Curſes may be *Blaſphemy*: *Faſhion's* is ſo in a horrible manner. This fine Gentleman does not ſtick to Curſe the Author of his Being, for making him younger than his Brother. But this is not all the *Blaſphemy* the *Relapſer* has to account for. And now at the cloſe of the Article I muſt own my ſelf ſurpriz'd at the Courage of the *Vindicator*. That a Man thus ill prepar'd, ſhould caſt the Cauſe upon ſo bold an Iſſue, preſs for a ſecond Hearing, and call for a Charge in Particulars!

Relapſe P. 44.

The *ſecond* Branch of the *Stage*'s Profaneneſs, is the Abuſe of *Religion* and *Holy Scripture*. How does the *Vindicator* excuſe himſelf here? He ſays, *Before he fell upon me for an Abuſer of* Holy Scripture, *he ſhould firſt clearly have prov'd, That no Story, Phraſe or Expreſſion whatſoever in the* Scripture, *ſhould be either repeated, or ſo much as alluded to upon the Stage.* In return to this, I muſt ſay, I have hinted this pretty ſtrongly already, and proved it by plain Implication. To argue the point

P. 13. View, &c. Ch. 2.

point more at length, I did not then think neceſſary. For what can be more evidently impious than to throw the moſt Solemn and the moſt Trifling things into the ſame Compoſition; to make *Religion* part of our Sport, and the *Bible* furniſh out the Stage? I thought no Perſon profeſſing Chriſtianity, could have wanted Information in this Caſe. But ſince I find the *Poet's* diſpoſed to Cavil, I have ſatisfi'd this Objection more at large in my *Reply* to Mr. *Congreve*. The *Vindicator*'s next attempt is very remarkable. See 4th. Poſtul.

The Scripture, ſays he, *is made up of Hiſtory, Prophecy, and Precept; which are things in their own Nature capable of no other Burleſque than what calls in queſtion either their Reality, or their Senſe.* To this I Anſwer, P. 14.

1*ſt*. That the *Vindicator* is out in his Notion of *Burleſque*. To *Burleſque* a Book, is to turn it into *Ridicule*. Now this may be done without queſtioning the Hiſtory or miſtaking the *Text*. To apply the Caſe: To doubt the Meaning of ſome part of the *Bible* may be done without a Fault. I confeſs, to queſtion any *Facts* in *Scripture* would be to renounce *Chriſtianity*. But then to make Diverſion with them is ſtill worſe; and adds Contempt, to Infidelity. Indeed, to take theſe Freedoms with Religion is a ſign of a ſlender Belief. We don't ſee *Comedy* Garniſh'd with *Parliament-Houſe-Speeches*. No. Where people are ſure to be *puniſh'd*, they are careful not to *provoke*.

2*ly*. To believe the *Scripture* God's Word, and to play with it, heightens the Preſumpti-

on. 'Tis a horrid Reflection on the Divine Wisdom; It supposes the concerns of the other World over flourish'd, that a Pompous out-side is given to things Insignificant, and that the weight of the Cause holds no proportion with the Solemnity of the Court. Now that this Gentleman has several times brought the *Bible* to jest for him, is clear beyond all Contradiction.

3*ly*. The *Vindicator* is cast upon his own state of the Case. For his *Play* not only questionsthe Truth of the *Scripture*, but denies it; and gives an Instance to prove the Assertion, and to give the more Credit to't, it comes from the best Character in the *Poem*. 'Tis done in a Soliloquy too, where according to our Author, *the Person who speaks is always supposed to deliver his real thoughts to the Audience*. *Amanda* is the Person; Lets hear her.

Vind. p. 76.

Relapse p. 97.

What slipery Stuff are Men composed of?
Sure the Account of their Creation's false,
And 'twas the Woman's Rib that they were formed of.

This Lady it seems spoke this for the good of the Publick; Her Business, like *Worthy*'s, was to instruct the Audience. Yes, the design of a *Soliloquy*, is to prevent misconstruction, to direct the Understanding, and secure the Interest of Virtue. 'Tis possible the *Account of Man*'s *Creation might have been thought true*, and the meaning of the *Relapse* misunderstood, if *Amanda* had not been drawn out single for this Service. Well. But *the Gentleman who writ this Speech is gone to* Muscovy. I hope not to tell them the *History* of the *Creation*

P. 21.

ation is falſe; well let him go, I think this *Town* may ſpare him. But tho the *Man* is gone to *Muſcovy*, the *Play* is here, and ſo is the Author too, who took the pious *Muſe* into his Protection and made her free of his *Poem*. Suppoſe this new *Lawreat* ſhould write a Treaſonable Copy of Verſes upon the *Czar*, and ſheer off from *Moſco* when he had done. Suppoſe a Brother *Poet* of the Place ſhould borrow them for his proper uſe, and Act and Publiſh them for his own. Would it be a ſufficient excuſe for the Latter to alledge that they were only borrowed, that his Friend was gone into a remote Country; but *That to his Knowledge he had too much Veneration for the Government to queſtion its Authority, or ſink its Credit?* I am afraid ſuch a Speech as this, would do but little Service at *Moſco*. It may not be amiſs for the *Vindicator* to conſider the Application, and the next time he has any *Exerciſe* made for him, to look a little better into the Contents.

We are now drawing towards particulars. The Hiſtory of *Adam*'s Fall is wretchedly made uſe of in the *Provok'd Wife*. *How the* Scripture *is affronted by this, the* Vindicator *can't tell; here's nothing that reflects upon the Truth of the Story*. No. Is the Ridiculous *Raſor* no diſadvantage to the Story? Does it not ſuffer by being mix'd up with Smut and Banter, and applied to a ſcandalous purpoſe. If theſe Liberties don't reflect upon the *Truth* of the *Story*, I am ſure they reflect upon the Significancy on't, and by conſequence upon the Honour of the Author. But by the *Vindicator*'s

P. 77. View, &c.

P. 77.

P. 14, 15.

dicator's Favour, I doubt it does reflect upon the *Truth of the Story*. For who that look'd on this Account as deliver'd by the *Holy Ghost* would treat it thus disrespectfully? Who that believed himself akin to *Adam* would use his
Vind. p. 15. Memory thus Coursely, Ridicule *his Folly* upon the *Stage*, and make a jest of his Misfortunes? The *Vindicator* concludes the Page with a Memorable Sentence, and gives us to understand, *That he shall always make a very great Distinction between his Respects to God and the De-*
Ibid. *vil. His Respects to God*, is somewhat Familiar. But he mends the Matter. He makes a very great Distinction between his Respects to God and the Devil! Then it seems he has some Regard for both of them, some Respects for the Devil. Truly one would almost think so, by his way of writing, and if we may argue from the Interest he promotes, I am afraid the bulk of the Distinction will lie the wrong way.

P 16. The *Vindicator* takes it ill of me for Censuring the Liberties given to Ld. *Foppington*. And *here* (he says) *I am as angry with him for being for Religion, as before for being against it.* Not altogether. However here's a frank Confession, that he was against *Religion* before. Now by his managing, one would guess he had not changed his side. For whatever his Meaning might be, his Method is somewhat untoward. For does not Ld. *Foppington* Droll upon the *Prayers*, upon *Sundays*, and *Sermons*? Does he not do it in Earnest? The *Vindicator* grants all this. Is he check't then by the Ladies, or exposed upon the Account? Very slen-

ſlenderly, if at all, *Berinthia* rather Prompts him, and *Amanda* only asks him if there was good *Preaching at* St. James's; *And that ſhe was the worſt Company in the World at Church, being apt to mind the Prayers and Sermon.* Relapſe P. 32, 33.

This is a poor Rebuke for ſuch Rampant Profaneneſs. And as the World goes, may eaſily be interpreted to Singularity, and Female Superſtition. Ay, *But* Foppington's *manner of ſpeaking; together with the Character he repreſents plainly inſtructs the Audience, that what he ſays of his Church Behaviour is deſigned for their Contempt and not for their Imitation.* 'Tis deſigned for their Diverſion, if he pleaſes, which I'm miſtaken if the Subject will allow of. Let Ld. *Foppington* ſpeak. View, &c. P. 78. p. 16. 17.

Ld. *Fop. Madam, Sunday is a vile Day, I muſt confeſs; I intend to move for leave to bring in a Bill, that the Players may work upon it.---A Man muſt have little to do there, that can give an account of the Sermon.----But if I can't give an account of the Ladies, I deſerve to be excommunicated.--There's my Lady Tattle,* &c. *are the prittieſt Company in the World.---One is ſtrangely apt at Church to mind what one ſhould not do,* meaning the *Prayers* and the *Sermon.* Relapſe P. 32. 33.

Now who can miſcarry under ſuch Inſtruction as This? A Man muſt be of a very low Form in his Underſtanding, not to ſee the Drift of the *Author*. This is Seraphick Satyr, all Light and Heat. Virtue muſt needs be refreſh'd, and Conſcience alarm'd ſtrongly, by ſuch Admonitions! Inſtead of giving a frightful Idea of Profaneneſs, the Matter is all turn'd into a Jeſt; and the Audience deſir'd to laugh at

at thoſe Practices, which will Damn them. Theſe are admirable Sentences to rally Religion with, to furniſh a young Libertine, and keep Atheiſm in Countenance! So much for the *Manner of Speaking*. And as for Lord *Foppington*'s Character, that won't excuſe him. As the Poet has managed the buſineſs, this Lord is not ſo contemptible. For ſome of the beſt Raillery in the Play falls to his ſhare, as I have ſhewn already. And were it otherwiſe, no pretence of Character can juſtifie ſuch profane Sallies. But theſe Poets, if they can get a Fool, a Bully, or a Libertine, to fly out into Smut, or Irreligion, they are ſafe enough. Thus they can Pleaſe and Fence, at the ſame time; and the Character, as they fancy, is a Cover for the Trick. But there is much more of Art, than Fair-dealing, in this Expedient. I wiſh they would conſider, 'tis the Poet that ſpeaks in the *Perſons* of the Stage; And that he who makes a Man Mad, muſt anſwer for his Diſtraction.

View, &c. p. 223.

View, p. 96. Anſ. to *Congr.*

The *Vindicator can find no Reaſon for my Quarrel to Young Faſhion, unleſs 'twas becauſe I took him for his Friend*. Then I was much to blame But the worſt is, this Gentleman contradicts himſelf in the next Sentence; and ſays, *I accus'd his younger Brother, for kicking his Conſcience down Stairs*. Well. That's ſomething; but not all the Quarrel. I complained of him likewiſe for a finiſhed Debauchee; and exhibited a long Bill againſt him. This the *Vindicator* is pleaſed to ſlide over: And inſtead of defending his Libertine, finds Fault with my calling him his *Favourite*. And why ſo? Has he not provided him

p. 17.

View, &c. p. 210, 211.

p. 18.

him a *Plot*, a Fortune, and a creditable Figure? And are not all theſe ſigns of good Will and Inclination? Well; but *his Wife is likely to make his Heart ake.* Indeed ſo ſays the *Vindicator.* But *Young Faſhion* tells another Story. He is in no Fright about the matter. Upon obſerving ſome ſigns of Extravagance in *Hoyden*, he ſays to himſelf, (and then you may be ſure *he delivers his real Thoughts to the Audience*) *'Tis no matter. She brings an Eſtate will afford me a ſeparate Maintenance.* We ſee here's no danger of Mortification. This Soliloquy is extreamly Moral! It teaches the Art of Marrying the Eſtate without the Woman, and makes a Noble Settlement upon Lewdneſs. Ibid. Relapſe, p. 64.

The Vindicator complains becauſe *I won't take his word in the Buſineſs of Pimping.* Under favour, he does me wrong; I never queſtion'd his Experience in theſe matters. Since he puts me upon't, I am willing to believe him a good Authority in the Caſe: And that he is well qualified to pronounce upon the Growth and Improvement of this Myſtery. What if the *Profeſſion ſoars ſomewhat higher than formerly, I hope 'tis not grown creditable*? If 'tis infamous in a Peaſant, 'tis more ſo in a Perſon of Figure? Why then is it not Laſh'd and Stigmatiz'd? Why han't we ſome of *Plautus*'s and *Terence*'s Diſcipline upon't? Why is the Poet's *Fine Gentleman* put upon this Drudgery? To uſe the Profeſſion thus gently, and pay it ſo fair a Reſpect, is the way to make it *ſoar* ſtill higher, and bring it more into Faſhion. But the *Vindicator*'s Civilities to *Pimping* were not the only Thing which I objected: I obſerved that *Worthy* p. 18.19. See Pref. Relapſe.

thy and *Berinthia* made it an Act of *Chriſtian*
View, &c. *Charity*, and rallied profanely upon the Office.
P. 79. 219. But 'tis not this Gentleman's Method, to ſpeak to the Difficulty.

He tells me 'tis a dull Thing, to expect any
P. 19. thing not dull from a *Nurſe*. And why ſo? As ſlender People are entertaining ſometimes. Why mayn't the Woman be a little Witty if ſhe was born ſo, eſpecially when ſhe is to divert the Company? All Nurſes are not Fools, any more than all Poets are Wits. Beſides, I did not expect any great matters from her in this kind. But though ſhe has not Wit, ſhe ought to have Humour? So that when ſhe is out of Character in her Profaneneſs, and ſpeaks contrary to Cuſtom and Probability, when the Race and Spirit of her Diſcourſe, lies only in the Abuſe of Two or Three ſolemn Ex-
Relapſe, P. 96. preſſions of *Scripture*, I ſay when this happens, 'tis pretty plain the Poets Deſign, is to treat the Audience at the Expence of Religion.

The *Vindicator* ſets down ſome more of *Nurſes* fine Speech which I had omitted. She calls *Bull* Prieſt of *Baal*, and tells him, her *Con-*
P. 20. *ſcience flies in her Face for taking his Advice*; *and that his Abſolution is not worth an old Caſſock*. Now all theſe fine Sentences are only for Diverſion. 'Tis nothing but *Cracking a Jeſt upon a Chaplain*; And he ſhould *be very ſorry to ſee the Day when*
Ibid. *ſuch a Liberty (where it has no Alluſion to Religion) ſhould be brought within the Verge of Profaneneſs*. And how does he prove a Jeſt on a Chaplain ſuch a warrantable piece of Raillery? Has not a Chaplain the ſame Commiſſion and Buſineſs with another Clergyman? And if ſo, why ſhould

ſhould his Treatment be more Coarſe? If there's no Diſtinction in the Office, why ſhould there be any in the Uſage? But it may be the *Vindicator* may think his Authority ſunk upon the Score of Obligation: And that *Eating* and *Drinking*, are better than *Prayers* and *Sacraments*. But this Paſſage of *Nurſes has no Alluſion to Religion*. That's ſtrange! Is ſporting in Scripture-Phraſe, ſo foreign to that Subject? Has the Drolling on the Prieſts Bleſſing, upon the Power of the *Keys*, and the Inſtitution of our Saviour, no Alluſiion to Religion? If this Gentleman had the ſtating of Profaneneſs, 'twould ſhrink into a narrow Compaſs. It would be no eaſy matter to talk amiſs; and the *Laity* would have as little Sin left them, as the *Clergy* would have fair Quarter. Ibid.

Worthy's Addreſs to the fine Procureſs *Berinthia*, muſt now be enquir'd into. Upon her promiſe of a Lewd Aſſiſtance, his Gratitude is wonderfully raiſed, and Devout. *Thou Angel of Light, let me fall down and adore thee. He ſays, if I had quoted her Anſwer, I had given a better Character of him; and he thinks, of my ſelf.* Truly I would gladly oblige both of us, but I'm afraid 'twon't do this time: However, let's hear *Berinthia*'s Anſwer. *Ber. Thou Miniſter of Darkneſs get up again; for I hate to ſee the Devil at his Devotions.* This is to make amends for t'other. I can't perceive how. One Man injures his Neighbour, and another blames him for't; does this cancel the guilt, & make the Fact nothing. One Man ſpeaks Blaſphemy, & another reproves him; does this juſtifie the Boldneſs, or make the Words unſpoken? But by this

Vin. p. 22. View, &c. P. 80.

p. 23.

Relapſe, p. 91.

An-

Vin.p.23. *Anſwer the Audience are put in mind, ſhe is not ſuppoſed to deſerve that Compliment.* I can't ſee that neither. *Berinthia*'s Anſwer looks rather like a deſign of carrying on the Profaneneſs, and continuing the Religious Banter. Her Character is looſe throughout the *Play*, and ſhe never ſays ought that's good, unleſs to abuſe it. The Poet might eaſily ſee, that Inſtruction in her Mouth was moſt likely to be miſunderſtood and miſcarry. There's no occaſion for much quoting, the next Lines will ſhew us how ſignificant her Advice muſt needs be.

Well, (*ſays* Worthy) *my incomparable* Berinthia, *how ſhall I requite you?*

Relapſe. Ibid. Ber. *O ne'er trouble your ſelf about that: Virtue* (alias Pimping) *is its own Reward. There's a Pleaſure in doing good, which ſufficiently pays it ſelf.* Here's a Lecture of Philoſophy well applied! This is an Admirable Lady to correct ill Sentences, and give Aim to the Audience! And yet the jeſt on't is, the Man's not pleaſed becauſe I did not commned him for his Care. Truly he muſt excuſe me, I am not ſo full of *Panegyrick* as this comes to.

I cited L. *Brute* for ſaying *the Part of a downright Wife is to Cuckold her Husband.* The addition of *ſetting it down as a Precept*, is all his own, and ſo conſequently is the *Foul Play* too, as will appear by the *Ladies* words.

Pro. Wife P. 3. View, &c. P. 83. *Belinda---- I could almoſt reſolve to play the downright Wife, and Cuckold him.* Is not to play the Knave, and to play the part of a Knave the ſame thing? This, tho it does not imply Duty and Precept, it ſuppoſes general

neral Practice, Truth in Notion, and propriety of Character: And as a Man cannot be ſaid to be a Knave, without playing Knaviſh Tricks; ſo by the *Poets* Reaſoning, a Woman can't be ſaid *to play the downright Wife*, unleſs ſhe injures her Husband. This is a great Compliment to the Ladies! And whether the *Vindicator* has Reaſon *to ask their Pardons for Lying*, in jeſt or in earneſt, the *Reader* muſt judge. Vin. p. 237

He owns Lady *Brute* in her next Reply, ſays, *that which at firſt View ſeems much more lyable to Exception.* This Confeſſion is more than ordinary; Let the Lady ſpeak. p. 24.

L. Brute, *Why, after all there's more to be ſaid for't* (for Adultery) *than you'd imagine Child. I know according to the ſtrict Statute Law of Religion, I ſhould do wrong; but if there were a Court of Chancery in Heaven, I ſhould be ſure to caſt him.*

Belind. *If there were a Houſe of Lords you might.*

L. Brute, *In either I ſhould infallibly carry my Cauſe. Why he is the firſt Aggreſſor.* (it had been worſe if he had been the ſecond.) *Not I.*

Belind. *Ay, but you know, we muſt return good for evil.* P. Wife. p. 4. View, &c. P. 83.

L. Brute, *That may be a miſtake in the Tranſlation.*

Thus the Juſtice of God, the Court of Heaven, and the Precepts of our *Saviour* are Ridiculed! And what can make ſatisfaction for theſe horrible outrages? Not all the Blood in a Man's Veins. The Mercy that pardons ſuch Boldneſs, had need be infinite! But the S. Mat. 5.

Vindicator has taken Care *that her Raillery ſhould not be miſtaken for her ſerious Opinion.* She tells *Bellinda, I ſhall play the Fool, and jeſt on, till I make you begin to think I am in earneſt.* This is an admirable Defence! The Woman Blaſphemes in jeſt, and diverts the Company with the *Bible*, and therefore all's well; and the *Poet muſt be commended for his Caution*! I perceive God and Religion are very Significant Things with ſome People!

Ibid. Pro. Wife p. 4. Ibid.

To diſengage *Young Faſhion* from his very profane Application of *Providence*. He ſays, *every body knows the Word* Providence *in common Diſcourſe goes for Fortune.* A Man that's ſinking will catch at a Weed. I am ſorry I muſt ſpend my time about Words, eſpecially in ſo plain a ſignification. But ſince the buſineſs muſt be undertaken, I ſhall endeavour at a brief Satisfaction. We may obſerve then that *Tully* in his Philoſophical Tracts diſtinguiſhes *Providence* from the *Epicurean* Syſtem of Chance and Fortune. *Providence* and *Divine Adminiſtration*, are with him the ſame Thing. The Emperour *Marcus Antonius Philoſophus* has this Religious Expoſtulation. τὶ μοὶ ζῆν ἐν κόσμῳ κενῷ θεῶν, ἢ προνοίας κενῷ. *Who would live in a World uninhabited by the Gods, and Providence?* Now for a little Engliſh Authority. Sir *Roger L'Eſtrange* in his *Æſop's Fables*, uſes the Word *Providence* frequently for the Government of the World by the Deity; but no otherwiſe that I remember. And more particularly in the 187, aud 211. Pages, he makes the Notion of *Fortune* and *Providence* diſtinct, and oppoſes the one to the other.

Relapſe P. 19. View, &c. P. 84. Cic. De. Na. Deo. Lib. 1. p. 4670, 4671. Lib. 2. p. 4732. 4764. Ed. Du. Pays. P. 68, 78. & alib.

This

This Gentleman is well known to be a Maſter of Stile, and therefore I chooſe to inſtance in him. Mr. *Dryden* another good Judge in Language, uſes, *Providence* in the ſame Senſe tho' not upon ſo good an Occaſion. To Conclude. The *Relapſer* himſelf ſhall come in Evidence, and Attack the *Vindicator* for once.

Don Seb. P. 51. Mock Au. P. 36.

Enter *Bull.*

Relapſe P. 97.

Bull, *What Providence orders, I ſubmit to.*

Nurſe, *And ſo do I, with all Humility.*

Coupler, *Why that now was ſpoke like good People.*

Thus we ſee from *Bull*'s Religious Character, from *Nurſe*'s ſolemn Acquieſcence, and from *Coupler*,s Reflection, the *Relapſer* takes *Providence* for *Divine* Appointment, and the Pleaſure of the firſt *Being.*

Berinthia comes again; and here the *Relapſer* has ſhewn us what ſpeed we may expect from him when he ſtrikes out. This Lady was *Worthy*'s Procureſs. To ſucceed in her Buſineſs ſhe tells *Amanda*, *He* (Mr. Worthy) *uſed you like a Text, he took you all to Pieces, but ſpoke ſo Learnedly--- One might ſee the Spirit of the Church was in him.* Now why does the *Vindicator* deny his own Words, and affirm the *Woman is not liken'd to a Text in general or any other way*? He had much better drop the Cauſe, than plead it thus untowardly. To return to the *Relapſe*. *Berinthia* goes on in Pulpit-Phraſe, and purſues her Employment very intelligibly. At laſt ſhe mentions *Uſe* and *Application*, and brings them up to the point of Debauchery. By her talking you would think there was little Difference be-

Vin. p. 26.

Relapſe P. 69.

tween Lewdneſs and Religion. And that Whoring and Preaching, a Church and a Bawdy-Houſe might be treated alike. This fine Diſcourſe the *Vindicator*, out of his great Modeſty, calls *an inoffenſive Simile, and ſays it abuſes no body.*

Vin. p. 26.

Berinthia concludes in Blaſphemy, and joins the Atheiſt and the Procureſs together. *Now conſider* (ſays ſhe) *what has been ſaid, and Heaven give you Grace to put it in Practiſe*; that is to take *Berinthia*'s lewd Counſel, to proſtitute her Virtue, and turn Whore. Theſe Words would be always Profane upon the *Stage*, but the Application of them here, is flamingly Blaſphemous. The *Vindicator*'s Defence is remarkable. He grants *theſe words are often uſed at the Cloſe of a Sermon, and therefore perhaps might as well have been let alone.* It ſeems the Caſe is ſomewhat doubtful, he is not ſure but that a Man may as well Blaſpheme as let it alone! One had need of Patience to read this. But St. *Michael* did not rail upon the Devil, and therefore I ſhall paſs it over. His lame excuſe from the *Character*, and *Manner*, I have diſproved already. This *Berinthia* has a very Scandalous Soliloquy; She thanks Heaven for her Impudence, and is nauſeouſly Bold, and Profane: Which, beſides the Irreligion, is an odd way of treating her Sex, and Figure.

Relapſe Ibid. View, &c. p. 84.

p. 27.

St. Jude.

Relapſe p. 49.

We are now come to the Abuſe of the Clergy. And here the *Vindicator*'s method of purging himſelf is extraordinary. He runs a great length of *Satyr* upon the Rights and Privileges of the *Clergy*. I perceive the little Juſtice I endeavoured to do that *Order*, won't down with

with him. By his Reaſoning one would think the World ſtrangely Prieſt Ridden, and all Ages, Countrys, and Religions, extreamly to blame! If you'l take his Word for't, *Riches*, *Plenty* and *Power*, are very improper things for a Church-Man. And yet this Gentleman owns *the Inſtitution of the Clergy to be the moſt Effectual means of promoting our Happineſs in this World, and the other.* Say you ſo? Then ſure they ought to have a ſhare in the Common Advantages. Acknowledgment ſhould always bear ſome Proportion to Obligation. Where's the Gratitude, or even the Juſtice of acting otherwiſe? If *Riches* and *Power* are things deſirable, why ſhould not the *Clergy* come in with the reſt; If they are not, why are they grudged them? To put the Prieſthood under a Diſadvantage in the *State*, only for having God's Commiſſion, is an odd way of ſhewing our Religion. 'Tis ſomewhat hard a Man ſhould be barr'd the Conveniences of this Life, for helping his Neighbours to a better. To proceed. Are not the Clergy of the ſame Humane Nature with other People? Have they not the ſame Neceſſities for this World, and the ſame Conſcience and Diſcretion to uſe it? Generally ſpeaking, *Poverty* does as ill with a *Prieſt*, as with a *Poet*. 'Tis apt to Sink the Spirits, to make the Mind grow Anxious, and Feeble in the diſcharge of Function. If *Riches* are ſo invincibly dangerous, why don't the Chriſtian *Laity* part with them, and like *Crates*, throw their Gold into the Sea? But does not this Plea for the Churches *Temporale* reflect on the Author of Chriſtianity; or as p. 30. Ibid.

the *Vindicator* too lightly expreſſes it, does it not ſuppoſe that *Chriſt and his Apoſtles, took the thing by the wrong handle*? By no means. The Caſe is not the ſame. The *Apoſtles* had a Power of working Miracles, to hold up their Character, and make way for their Doctrine. They could cure Diſeaſes, and inflict them; Kill and make Alive, Puniſh and oblige in the higheſt manner. They had Nature at their beck, and Omnipotence about them. Such Credentials needed no other Recommendation. Such Illuſtrious *Poverty* out-ſhines Imperial Grandeur, and makes a Cottage look nobler than a Court. But this Glorious Aſſiſtance was lent but for a few Ages. When Chriſtianity was once Eſtabliſh'd, and Princes converted to the Faith, the End of Miracles went off, and the Power was recall'd. From this time the Church was left in ſome meaſure to humane Prudence, and Civil Policy. When the Heavens were thus ſhut in; and the other World withdrew, there was more occaſion of recourſe to This. Now, Temporal Advantage, and Secular Support, grew much more ſeaſonable, and the Church was oblig'd to preſerve her Authority by ſome of the Methods of Civil Governours. But the *Vindicator* ſays, *Religion is not a Cheat, and therefore has no need of Trappings.* A Judge is no Cheat neither. 'Tis well known he has a good Commiſſion. To what purpoſe then are all theſe Formalities of the Court; All this Expence in Solemnity and Retinue? Can't the old Gentleman come like an *Utopian Syphogranta*, with a wiſp of Graſs upon a Pole. Away, crys the *Vindicator*, with all

Vind. P. 30, 31.

Acts 3. 8. & 5. 5, 10. & 28. 8. 1 Cor. 5. 5.

P. 39.

Moor's Utop.

all this unneceſſary State. Why muſt the *Charge* be given in *Furs* and *Scarlet*, when the Law will operate every jot as well in *Leather*? However, this Gentleman will have it that *an Ambaſſador who comes with advantageous Propoſals, ſtands in no need of Equipage to procure him Reſpect*. This Project would ſave a great deal of Money? But there are few Princes of his Mind. What does the *Vindicator* mean by all this good Husbandry? Would he have an *Ambaſſador* travel like a *Carrier* with a *Port-Mantua* behind him? Such Equipage would repreſent ſtrongly, and give a noble Idea of his Buſineſs. In ſhort, as things ſtand, Government of all kinds, requires ſomewhat of Figure. Appearance goes a great way in the Expediting of Affairs. Naked Reaſon won't always do. The generality muſt have their Senſes ſtruck, and their Imagination affected. Thus Authority is beſt refreſh'd, and the Ends of the Inſtitution ſecured. For this purpoſe Miracles were wrought; and when they ceaſe, 'tis proper to apply to the uſual Expedients. Ibid.

And now I ſhall venture to confront the firſt Article of his *Hereſy*, as he calls it, with this Truth, *viz. That the Shepherd who has* leaſt Meat, *at home in his Houſe, has moſt Buſineſs*: For Indigence has a very working Head; and a Man is always moſt full of Care, when he does not know how to live: And for the ſame Reaſon, he that has the beſt Fortune, may be moſt at leiſure, becauſe he has others to manage his Affairs. Vin. p. 31.

The Vindicator in his 2*d*. Article diſcourſes
p. 32. of *Sauce* and *Sops*, &c. But he has cook'd the Allegory ſo oddly, that I know not well what to make on't. If he reaſons from the Kitching upon theſe ſubjects, he muſt talk by himſelf. His 3*d*. Article I have ſpoken to already, and am
p. 38, 39. now to conſider it farther. For

The *Vindicator* pretends, That *Piety*, *Learning*, *Charity an Humility*, *would ſecure the Clergy from Neglect much better than Power*, *and Revenue*. Upon a View of the whole, one and t'other will be found to do very well together.

For 1*ſt*. If Piety and Power are not to be reconcil'd, and a Man muſt either throw up his Fortune or his *Creed*, the Laity will be oblig'd to the ſame Reſignation. The Incloſures of Property and Privilege muſt be broken down, and all things laid in Common. But if 'tis poſſible for a Man to be pious with a Penny in his Poket, the Clergy I ſuppoſe may be ſo, with as little difficulty as their Neighbours. Then as for *Learning*, Poverty, and this Advantage, are inconſiſtent. As the World goes, there's little Knowledge to be had without Money. A Man may get Honeſty for nothing; but if he'll have any Senſe to't more than ordinary, he muſt pay for't. There are ſome few Exceptions to this Rule, but generally ſpeaking, it holds true. To go on. *Charity* is much better exerciſed with *Revenue*, than without it. 'Tis true, a Beggar may have as large a Soul as a Prince. But will Without Power, is neither ſo clear nor ſo ſerviceable. He that can go no farther than a good wiſh, is oftentimes only kind in his Conſcience, and

a Benefactor to himſelf. For where the Heart is inviſible, the Obligation muſt be ſo too. But Power brings ſecret Goodneſs into Light, and makes it appear unqueſtionable. And to come cloſer to the ſubject, I believe if the *Preacher* could Dine all the Poor of the *Pariſh* every *Sunday*, his Sermon would be more ſignificant. His Table would aſſiſt his Pulpit, and his Charity reinforce his Reaſoning. They'd firſt come to him for the *Loaves*, and then for the *Doctrine*. And laſtly, as for *Humility*, I agree with the *Vindicator*; I think it moſt neceſſary; and that no Man can be a Chriſtian without it. But whether I have the ſame Notion of this Virtue with our Author or not, I can't tell. To be humble, a Man is bound not to be full of himſelf, or grow ſtiff upon any Advantage, but give all the Glory to God. He muſt be fair in Converſation, not deſpiſe the leaſt Mortal, but rather ſtoop to oblige thoſe upon lower Ground. Thus far without doubt all Clergy Men, and all Chriſtians are concern'd to be Humble. But to be ſervile and ſheepiſh to Humour Pride, and blow up Conceit, this is quite another thing. There's neither Humility, Diſcretion, nor ſo much as Honeſty, in ſuch Management. 'Tis little Knavery, and paraſitical Meaneſs; and Church Men, of all People, ſhould ſtand clear of ſo uncreditable an Imputation. Now 'tis this ſort of Humility the *Stage* would put upon them. The *Vindicator* and Mr. *Congreve*, are wonderfully for an humble Clergy: And ſo are ſome of the proudeſt Men I ever met with. If 'tis ſaid the Clergy

Congrev. Amend.

Clergy are bound to be *exemplary*, I willingly grant it. But Example ſuppoſes other Perſons concern'd beſides thoſe who ſet it. If the *Clergy* are to be Examples,'tis becauſe the *Laity* are bound to follow them: And in Humility too, as well as in other Duties. For if the *Teachers* are bound to be Humble, the *Hearers* without queſtion are under the ſame Obligation. The Argument Might be preſſed farther, But I rather chuſe to leave it with the *Reader*. And ſince we are on the Subject of Humility, the *Vindicator* and Mr. *Congreve* would do well to think on't. If as this Gentleman obſerves, *He who teaches Piety and Morality to the World, is a great Benefactor to Mankind*: Then by the Rule of Contraries, he who teaches Immorality muſt be as great a Nuſance. He who makes it his Buſineſs to exterminate Vertue, aud Conſcience, and Debauch both Practice and Principle, muſt needs be a Misfortune to the Age. Unleſs they can clear themſelves of this Imputation, they ought to be wonderfully modeſt and unpretending. To be the Author of irreparable Miſchief; to deſtroy the Innocence of Life, the Securities of Government, and the Expectations of the World to come, are Powerful Reaſons for Humility. Thoſe who in any Meaſure lye under this Charge, can hardly bend too low, or think themſelves leſſer than really they are.

Pro. Wife P. 45, 46, 51, 52. View, &c. P. 180.

The *Vindicator* would make us believe, that Sir *John Brute*'s debauching in a *Gown*, was no Abuſe of the Clergy. That's ſtrange! I take it the Company were merry with the Diſguiſe. 'Twas the Habit and Function which made

made the Scene diverting. The Oaths and Lewdneſs would not have made half the Muſick in a Lay-Character: And the *Conſtable*'s Jeſts would have been but heavy upon another occaſion. Beſides Sir *John* is made to abuſe his pretended Brethren, and the Juſtice falls in general upon the *Order*. And is it no Diſſervice to be thus executed in Effigie, and made a Mad-man by *Repreſentation*? If a Lewd Perſon could ſteal his Neighbour's Shape, and then play all his Pranks in't, I ſuppoſe he would have no Thanks for his Pains. When the Badge of a Man's Office which ſhould give him Credit, is ſhewn ridiculous, I fancy, he has Reaſon to complain. If the *Vindicator* is of another Mind, let him practiſe the ſame Liberty upon a *Judge*, or a *Lord Mayor*, and ſee how the Jeſt will take. Pro. Wife 45, 51.

I obſerv'd upon the *Relapſe*, that *Bull* the Chaplain, wiſh'd the Married Couple Joy, in Language horribly Smutty and Profane. I confeſs, I could not go on with it. And what ſays the *Vindicator* to this? Why he plucks up his Spirits, and lays it all upon the Board; no body could have tranſcrib'd a foul Paſſage more honeſtly. And now who would ſuſpect the Man to be otherwiſe than Innocent? Thus ſome People when they are going to put a Trick upon you, ſtrip their Arm bare, and pretend ſtrongly to fair Dealing. But here the matter was too groſs for a cleanly Conveyance. To argue this Point any farther, would be an ill Complement to the *Reader*, and therefore I ſhall paſs it over. I charg'd the *Relapſe*, *Preface* and *Play*, with a great deal more View, &c. 109. Rela. 74. P. 35. View, &c. 109 110, 232.

more ſcandalous Abuſe of the *Clergy*; but this the *Vindicator* is pleaſed to overlook. And as
P. 35. to the irreligious part, he only ſays, *'tis juſt as profane as the reſt*; which though it may not come up to the Merits of ſome Paſſages, is Character bad enough in all Conſcience.

We are now advanced to a new *Chapter*.
P. 44. And here the Vindicator would fain know which way I make it appear, *That* Conſtant *is his Model for a fine Gentleman; and that he is brought upon the Stage for Imitation.* This demand is eaſily ſatisfyed. That he ſtands for a fine Gentleman, is evident from his Senſe, his Breeding, and his Figure? Now theſe Circumſtances, with the fair Treatment he meets with, make him a *Model* for *Imitation*. This Conſequence follows naturally from the Advantage of his Character. For moſt young People of any pretences, love to be counted fine Gentlemen. And when Vice has Credit, as well as Pleaſure annext, the Temptation is dangerouſly fortified.
P. 45.

The *Vindicator* tells the Reader, *That this honeſt Dr. does not underſtand the Nature of Comedy, tho he made it his Study ſo long. For the buſineſs of Comedy is to ſhew People what they ſhould do, by repreſenting them doing what they ſhould not do. Nor is there any Neceſſity to explain the Moral to the Audience.* For all this livelineſs I'm afraid this honeſt Poet, neither underſtands *Comedy*, nor himſelf, and that's ſomewhat worſe. Not himſelf, becauſe he contradicts what he
Vin. p. 9. wrote before. For in the beginning of his *Vindication* he acquaints us how careful he was to explain the *Moral*, for fear of miſconſtruction.

Yes;

Yes; for fear the *Boxes* and *Pit* ſhould miſinterpret him. But now the Tale is quite turn'd, and there's no need of a Philoſopher to unriddle the Myſtery. P. 45.

2*ly*. He miſtakes the *Nature* of *Comedy*. This we may learn from *Ben. Johnſon*, who acquaints the *Univerſity*, *that he has imitated the Conduct of the Antients*: *In whoſe Comedies the Bauds*, &c. *yea and oft-times the Maſters too*, *are multed*, *and that fitly*, *it being the Office of a* Comick Poet *to imitate Juſtice*, *and inſtruct to Life*. Is it the Office of a Comick Poet to *imitate Juſtice*, &c. then certainly Rewards and Puniſhments ought to be rightly apply'd: Then a Libertine ought to have ſome Mark of diſfavour ſet upon him, and be brought under Diſcipline and Diſgrace. To ſay the *Buſineſs of Comedy is to ſhew People what they ſhould do*, *by repreſenting them doing what they ſhould not*, is a pleaſant way of arguing: What is the Stage to be read Backwards, and conſtrued by Contradiction? When they talk Smut muſt we underſtand them in a Sence of Modeſty; and take all their Profaneneſs for Pious Expreſſion? Then by the ſame Rule, when they ſay any thing that's good, we muſt conclude they have a Lewd Meaning. This is an admirable Compaſs to ſail by; ſuch Piloting muſt needs diſcover all the Rocks and Quick-ſands in the Voyage! This undiſtinguiſhing Method at the beſt, would be like pulling up the Buoys, quitting the Helm, and leaving the Paſſengers to Steer at their Diſcretion. But as the Poets manage the matter, 'tis ſtill more dangerous. For to ſhew a *Religious Perſon* ridiculous; to give Figure and Succeſs to Fox Ep. Ded. View, &c. P. 151. 153, 164.

to an ill Character, and make Lewdneſs Modiſh and Entertaining, is the way to miſmark the Nature of Good and Evil, and confound the Underſtanding of the Audience.

Vin. p. 46. 'Tis the way to hide the *Flaws* in Behaviour, to Varniſh the *Deformity*, and make the *Blemiſhes* look ſhining. The *Vindicator* inſiſts, *That* Conſtant *ſays nothing to juſtifie the Life he leads, except*, &c. What needs he? He is ſufficiently juſtified in his Character and Uſage, and in not

P. 47. being puniſh'd. Let's have the reſt. *He does not juſtifie the Life he leads, except where he's pleading with Lady* Brute, *to debauch her, and ſure no body will ſuppoſe him there to be ſpeaking much of his Mind.* Why not? Does a Man who argues againſt Conſcience, and talks like an Atheiſt, never ſpeak his Mind? If a Libertine pleads in his own Defence, why muſt he not be ſuppoſed to be in earneſt? Beſides, how could *Conſtant* expect to carry the Cauſe, unleſs the Colours look'd fair, and the Reaſoning probable? To give this Spark his due, he makes the moſt of his Matters. He endeavours to inform the

Pr. Wife P. 34. Lady, *That Virtue conſiſts in Goodneſs and Pity, not in ſnarling ſtraitlaced Chaſtity. That Honour is a phantome, and that the Importance of it lies in the Cuſtom of the Country, not in the Nature of the Thing*; and pretends precedents for a contrary *Practice*. In ſhort, *Hobs*, and *Spinoſa* could ſcarcely have ſaid more for him. This is ad-

Ibid. mirable inſtruction! And *Lady Brute* for all the ſhrewdneſs of her *Anſwers*, confeſſes her ſelf puzzl'd, and ſuffers the Intrigue to go on.

Pro. Wife 35. In a word, if the *Young Ladies* (the Vindicator takes ſuch Care of) have nothing but this *Dialogue*

logue for their Security, I ſhould think them in a dangerous Condition. And here I can't but take Notice, how the *Vindicator* contradicts himſelf again. He makes the Lady turn *Philoſopher*, and gives an *Interpreter to the Pop-pet-Show.* Vin. p. 47. Vin. p. 45. 47.

I tax'd his *Bellinda* for confeſſing her Inclination to a Gallant. For this he calls me *an unfair Adverſary*, as if I had miſreported him, adding withall, that *Belinda* only ſays, *If her Pride ſhould make her Marry a Man ſhe hated, her Virtue would be in danger from the Man ſhe lov'd.* His Play will ſoon decide this Controverſy, and ſhew on which ſide the Unfairneſs lies, *Bellinda*'s words are theſe: View, &c. 146. P. 47. Vin. p. 48.

Bellind. *to Lady* Brute. *O' my Conſcience were it not for your Affair in the Ballance, I ſhould go near to pick up ſome odious Man of Quality yet, and only take poor Heartfree for a Gallant.* This very *Bellinda*, a little before adviſes Lady *Brute* to ſurrender her Virtue to *Conſtant.* The Lady requites her in a ſuitable Encouragement. Pro. Wife P. 64. Pro. Wife p. 45.

Lady *Br. If you did commit Fornication Child, 'twou'd be but a good friendly part, if 'twere only to keep me in Countenance whilſt I commit*--- So it ſeems, ſhe muſt turn Whore out of good Breeding. Theſe two Ladies in a private Dialogue, where we muſt ſuppoſe their Hearts are open, are extreamly inſtructive and civil to their Sex? *Lady Brute* informs her Neece, that the Men are moſt of them Atheiſts, and believe the Women to be no better; that by a Woman of *Reputation*, is meant no more than a Woman of *Diſcretion.* To this Accuſation the Lady pleads guilty, and confeſſes, *That want of Inclination* Ibid.

clination ſeldom protects any of her Sex. And as for *Fear*, 'tis too weak a Reſtraint to hold them long. And were it not for their Cowardice, they would likewiſe venture upon all the Maſculine Vices of *Fighting*, *Swearing*, *Blaſpheming*, &c. Here you have the Secrets of the *Cabinet*, and Truth and Ceremony in abundance. This Author in his *Vindication* Courts the *Sex* in his own Perſon. *With all due Reſpects* (ſays he) *to the Ladies, a Biſhoprick may prove as weighty a Reward, as a Wife, or a Miſtreſs either.* It ſeems then in the Scale of this Civil Gradation, a *Miſtreſs*, that is a Strumpet, is a weightier Reward than a Wife. Truly I think the *Vindicator* pays his Reſpects to the Ladies in this place, almoſt as untowardly as he did to the Devil before.

Pr. Wife. p. 65.

Vin. p. 44. 45.

To conclude with the Provok'd Wife. The Men of Figure in this *Play* (excepting the Juſtice who makes but a ſhort Enter) are profeſſed Libertines, and paſs off without Cenſure or Diſappointment. I grant Sir *John*'s Character has ſome Strokes of Diſcouragement, but he's made pretty eaſy at laſt, and brought to no Pennance. The Women have ſome of the ſame Inclinations; and the ſame good Luck with them. 'Tis true *Lady Fanciſull* miſcarries in her Deſign; has her Diſguiſe pull'd off, and falls under ſome Confuſion. But then we are to take notice, that this Lady was the moſt Modeſt of the Company. What e're her Thoughts were, ſhe has the Diſcretion to keep them in Reſerve. This Squeamiſhneſs, 'tis poſſible, drew down the Severity of the *Poet*. Had ſhe been as bad as the reſt, ſhe might

Pr. Wife. P. 76, 77.

might have fared better. But it ſeems, a pretence to Virtue is an unſufferable Boldneſs; and ſhe muſt be puniſh'd, *in Terrorem* to her Sex.

This ſort of Management puts me in mind of Mr. *Dennis*'s Ingenuity. He frankly confeſſes Lewdneſs promoted by the *Stage*. This is clear dealing: And I ſuppoſe the main Reaſon of his ſaying that the *Play-Houſe* Contributes ſo much to the Happineſs of the Nation.

We are now come forward to the *Remarks* upon the *Relapſe*. And here the *Vindicator* does as good as confeſs he has *made many fooliſh Miſtakes in his Play*. And by a peculiar happineſs in his Underſtanding, ſeems both ſenſible, and ſatisfied with it. Vin. p. 56. 57.

The *Vindicator* pretends much to Morals and Inſtruction about *Loveleſs* and *Amanda*; but can't forbear running upon the old *Haunt*. For after having made himſelf merry with a *Veniſon Paſty and a Tankard of Ale*; he falls a quoting the *Lords-Prayer* about his Play, and in different Characters, to make us ſenſible of his Devotion. P. 61

He goes on in the Relation of his *Fable*, quotes *Lead us not into Temptation*, once again; and ſays *Loveleſs had no farther occaſion for that Petition.* I wiſh the *Poet* is not of *Loveleſs*'s Opinion. His making bold with ſo ſolemn a Sentence upon ſo light a Subject, is ſomewhat to be ſuſpected. P. 65.

He informs us that *Loveleſs* and *Amanda*'s *Virtue was built upon a Rock, and raiſed upon the utmoſt ſtrength of Foundation, and had Religion*, &c. *to defend it*. And yet this pious Couple are for *Mahomet*'s Paradiſe, and wiſh for Immortal Senſualities. P. 65. 69. Relapſe P. 2, 3.

He would make *Loveleſs* and *Amanda* the
P. 71. *chief Characters by the Importance of the Deſign. The Importance of his Play is Diverſion*; And to gain this he has broke through the Rules of the *Dra-*
Vin. p. 60. *ma*. But let his Private Deſign be what it will, I ſtill ſay, *Young Faſhion*, *Lord Foppington*, and their Party, make the principle Figure in the *Play*: The Plot, the Fortune, and the Concluſion, the greateſt part of the *Play*, and of the Perſons too is on their ſide. As for poor *Loveleſs*, he ſinks in the middle of the *Fourth Act*, and you may go look him. Here the *Vindicator* could not find in his Heart to quote fair; however, he makes a ſhift to ſay, *that if the* Play
p. 72. *had ſunk in the Fourth Act too, it had been better than 'tis by juſt twenty* per Cent. If he does not mean Pounds, I agree with him, ſo far as to own that if it had ſunk in the *Third Act* it had been more Valuable. For ſome *Entertainments* like Dirty way, are always the better for being ſhort. However does not this Confeſſion prove the Truth of my Remarks, and that *Loveleſs* was a Character of inferiour Conſideration? Does the main Concern uſe to die ſo long before the *Epilogue*, and the cheif Perſon go off when about a *Third* of the *Play* is remaining?

The *Vindicator* gives a Home Thruſt at Parting, but his Weapon like *Scaramouchy*'s is
P. 73, 74. made of a Ruſh. He complains mightily of *unfair Dealing*, and pretends I have ridicul'd the Morality of the *Scene* between *Worthy* and *Amanda*. Thus he endeavours to *caſt* a *Miſt* before the *Reader*, but a Man muſt have bad Eyes not to ſee through it: For in this Reflection upon

upon *Worthy*, I was not examining the *Moral*, but the *Dramatick* Virtues of his *Play*. This was ſo plain that 'twas impoſſible for the *Vindicator* to overlook it. I ſay my *Remarks* in this Place were only upon the *Manners* in a *Poetick* Senſe. My Buſineſs here was to ſhew the Inconſiſtency of *Worthy*'s Character, and the unlikelyhood of his Reformation, indeed what can be more improbable than ſo ſuddain a Change in behaviour? This Spark immediately before his Lecture of Philoſophy had told *Amanda* that *Sin no more was a Task too hard for Mortals*. This by the way is a bold Contradiction of our *Saviour*, 'tis impious in the Aſſertion, and Lewd in the Application; ſo few words can hardly be charged with more Profaneneſs. Here the *Relapſer* calls the Senſe of the *Scripture* in queſtion, charges the Text with Untruth, and does that which by his own Confeſſion amounts to *Burleſque*.

View, &c. P. 218, 226, 227.

Relapſe, P. 100. Joh. 8. 11.

Vin. p. 14.

To return to *Worthy*, what can be more improbable than that ſo Profane and finiſhed a *Debauchee*, ſo weak in *Principle*, and ſo violent in *Paſſion*, ſhould run from one extream to another? Should break through Cuſtom, and metamorphoſe Deſire at ſo ſhort a Warning? To Solicit to Rudeneſs, and talk Sentences and Morality, to be Pious and Profane in the ſame Breath muſt be very extraordinary. To be all Pleaſure and Mortification ſo juſt together, a Mad-man one Minute, and a Hermit the next, is one would think ſomewhat forc'd and unnatural: It looks at beſt but like the Grimace of a Diſappointment, the *Fox*'s Virtue when the Grapes were above his Reach.

To make a Libertine talk like *Plato*, or *Socrates*, is Philoſophy miſplaced, 'tis good advice, but out of Character; The Soil and the Plant, the Man and the Morals won't agree.

Thus it appears the *Blot* he makes ſo much
P. 73, 74. a noiſe with, lies in his own *Tables*; whether I have hit it, or not, the *Reader* muſt judge.
P. 78. I am glad to hear him talk of his *Grave*: 'Twas a ſeaſonable Thought, and I heartily wiſh its due improvement; Such a Conſequence wou'd be of great ſervice, both to himſelf and the Publick. For then, I am well aſſured he would neither write *Plays*, nor defend them, at the rate he has done.

I have nothing farther with the *Vindicator*; but before I Conclude, I ſhall ſpeak to one Objection propoſed by the *Defender of Dramatick Poetry*, and Mr. *Dennis*. Theſe Authors endeavour to juſtifie the *Theatre* from the ſilence of the *Scriptures*. "The Word of God (ſay they)
Defence of *Dram. Poetry* P. 40, 43, 55, 56. "has no where condemned *Plays*, the *Apoſtles* "who were particular in other Caſes, have "given the *Stage* no Reprimand, nor Chriſtians any warning againſt it: And which is
The Uſefulneſs of the Stage, P. 138. 139. &c. "more, St. *Paul* makes no difficulty in citing "*Menander* a Comick *Poet*, which he would "not have done unleſs he had approved both "the Author and his Buſineſs too. This is the ſum of what they offer. Now the Plea of St. *Paul's* citing *Menander*, is extreamly ſlender. every foreign Sentence in *Scripture* is not commended by the bare mention. The Devil's Maxim of *Skin for Skin*, &c. is ſet down, but not
Job. 2. 4. for

for our Imitation. I grant this Verſe of *Menander* is Moral, and Sententious; and without doubt St. *Paul* cited it to put the Chriſtians upon their Guard, and that they might be aſham'd to fall ſhort of the Inſtructions of the *Heathens*. But to infer that St. *Paul* approved all that *Menander* had written, and that the *Apoſtle* recommended *Plays*; to the *Corinthians*: To conclude all this from one ſingle Line of Quotation, is prodigious Conſequence. This Latitude, would juſtifie the *Stage* to purpoſe, and make the Lewdeſt Authors paſs Muſter. There being few Books ſo entirely vitious as not to afford an inoffenſive and ſignificant Period. I don't ſpeak this with Application to *Menander*, for as *Plutarch* obſerves, he was with reſpect to *Ariſtophanes*, a very Modeſt *Poet*. Beſides this very quotation *that Evil Communication cnrrupts good Manners*, diſſerves the purpoſe 'twas brought for. 'Tis a ſharp Rebuke of the Licentiouſneſs of our *Stage*, and a plain Diſcountenance of ſo ſcandalous a Diverſion.

To proceed with the Objection. I affirm that *Plays* are plainly condemned in *Scripture* upon two accounts. I ſay they are clearly condemned tho' not by expreſs Prohibition; yet by Principle and Conſequence, which is the ſame thing.

1. They are condemned upon the ſcore of *Idolatry*; They were parts of *Pagan* Worſhip, and under that Notion unlawful to Chriſtians. But this Reaſon expiring in a great Meaſure with the *Heathen* Religion, I ſhall inſiſt on it no farther. However it proves thus much, that the unlawfulneſs of every Liberty is not par-

P. 140, 142. ticularly Mark'd in *Scripture*. For in the *Apoſtles* time, Mr. *Dennis* allows *Plays* were Idolatrous and unlawful; and yet we ſee the Holy *Text*, does not declare againſt the *Theatre* by Name.

2, The *Stage*, (particularly the *Engliſh* one) is condemned in *Scripture* upon the ſcore of Smut and Profaneneſs; upon the Account of the *Danger* and *Indecency* of ſuch Liberties. We are ſtrictly commanded in *Scripture not to Swear at all, to put away all Blaſphemy and filthy Communication out of our Mouth*; *To ſerve God with Reverence, to be Sober and Vigilant. To paſs the time of our ſojourning here in fear, and abſtain from all appearance of Evil.* And in a Word, *To have no pleaſure in* Scandalous Practices, *no fellowſhip with the unfruitful works of Darkneſs, but rather reprove them.* Here's Evidence enough in all reaſon, theſe Admonitions are full againſt our *Stage*. Not one *Play* in forty can ſtand the *Teſt* of ſo much as one ſingle *Text*. Bring the *Theatre* but to the *Bible*, and the Idol is preſently diſcover'd, and falls like *Dagon* before the *Ark*.

S. Mat. 5. James 5. Epheſ. 5. Colloſ. 3. Heb. 12. 1 Pet. 1. 1 Pet. 5. 1 Theſ. 5. Ro. 1. 32. Eph. 5. 11

1 Sam. 5. 3.

This Argument from the ſilence of our *Saviour* and his *Apoſtles* is anſwered at large by the Biſhop of *Meaux* in his late Book againſt the *Stage*. Which being ſo much to the purpoſe, I ſhall tranſlate it for the *Reader*.

Maximes & Reflexions ſur la Comedie. P. 71. &c.

" Thoſe (ſays he) who would draw any Advantage from this Silence may by the ſame Reaſon defend the Barbarities of the *Gladiators*, and other abominable *Spectacles*, which are all unmentioned in *Scripture*, no leſs than *Plays*. The Holy Fathers who have dealt with this Objection, will furniſh us

" with

" with Matter for a Reply, we ſay then, That " all engaging Repreſentations which excite, " and fortify unlawful Deſires, are condemn'd " in *Scripture*, together with the Vices they " tend to. For the Purpoſe, Lewd Pictures are " cenſured by all thoſe Paſſages which declare " in general againſt Immodeſty; and the ſame " may be ſaid of *Dramatick* Repreſentations. " St. *John* has comprehended the whole of this " Subject in the following Injunction. *Love not the World, neither the things that are in the World:* 1 Jo. 2. 15. *If any Man love the World, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the World, is the Luſt of the Fleſh, and the Luſt of the Eyes, and the Pride of Life*, which Luſt or Concupiſcence, *is not of the Father, but of the World.* " Now if theſe Things, and Inclinations, *are* " *not of God*, the moving Repreſentations, and " Charming Images of them, are not of *Him* " neither, but *of the World*; and by Conſequence " Chriſtians have nothing to do with them.

" St. *Paul* likewiſe has ſumm'd up the Ar- " gument in theſe words. *Finally my Brethren, whatſoever things are true, whatſoever things are honeſt, whatſoever things are juſt, whatſoever* Phil. 4. 8. *things are pure*, (or according to the *Greek whatſoever things are chaſt*) *whatſoever things are lovely, whatſoever things are of good Report; if there be any Virtue, or if there be any praiſe, think on theſe things.* " As if he " had ſaid, whatever hinders you from think- " ing on theſe things, and poſſeſſes you with " contrary Amuſements, ought not to be en- " tertain'd as a Pleaſure, but ſuſpected as " dangerous. In this beautiful Collection of

" Thoughts which St. *Paul* recommends to a " Chriſtian, there's no finding a Place for the " Modern *Theatre*, how much ſoever it may " be in the Favour of ſome Secular People.

" Farther, The Silence of our Saviour upon " the Argument of *Plays*, puts me in Mind " that he had no occaſion to mention them to " the Houſe of *Iſrael*, to which he was ſent, " theſe Diverſions being never admitted in " that Nation. The *Jews* had no *Shews* to en- " tertain them but their Feaſts, their Sacri- " fices, and their Holy Ceremonies. They " were formed by their Conſtitution to a plain " and natural way of Living; They knew no- " thing of theſe Fancies and Inventions of
Numb. XXiii. 23. " *Greece*: So that to the praiſes which *Balaam* " gives them, that *there is no Enchantmeut in* " *Jacob, nor Divination in Iſrael*; We may like- " wiſe add, there was no Theatre among " them; nothing of theſe dangerous Amuſe- " ments to be met with. This Innocent unde- " bauch'd People, took their Recreations at " Home, and made their Children their Di- " verſion. Thus after their Labours in the " Fields, and the Fatigues of their Dome- " ſtick Affairs; they relieved their Spirits, as " their Patriarchs had done before them. In- " deed if we conſider the matter rightly, " ther's no need of making a Buſineſs of Plea- " ſure: Nature is eaſily refreſh'd without this " Expence and Curioſity.

" The Apoſtle's ſaying nothing expreſly on " this Subject may poſſibly be reſolved into " the reaſon abovemention'd. Theſe Holy " Men being bred to the plain Guſt of their

" Fore-

"Forefathers, might not think themſelves "concerned to write directly againſt thoſe "practices with which their Nation was un-"acquainted: 'Twas ſufficient for them to lay "down Principles by which ſuch Liberties "were diſcountenanced: The Chriſtians were "well ſatisfied their Religion was founded on "the Jewiſh, and that the Church never al-"lowed of thoſe Diverſions which were ba-"niſh'd the *Synagogue*. But let the matter be "how it will, this *Precedent* of the Jews reach-"es home to the Profeſſors of Chriſtianity. It "being a Shame that the *Spiritual Iſrael* ſhould "indulge their Senſes in thoſe Pleaſures, "which the *Carnal People* knew nothing of.

Before I diſmiſs the *Reader*, I'le juſt give him a taſte of Mr. *Dennis*'s Skill and Modeſty in anſwering a Teſtimony.

I cited *Plutarch* to ſhew the Opinion of the *Athenians* concerning *Plays*: This People (ſays "he) thought *Comedy* ſo unreputable a perfor-"mance, that they made a Law, that no "Judge of the *Areopagus* ſhould make one. Here Mr. *Dennis* replies very roundly, *This Citation is abſolutely falſe*. Right! 'Tis falſe in the *Latin*, but 'Tis true in the *Greek*. τὴν μὲν κωμῳδοποίαν οὕτως ἄτεμνοα ἡγοῦντο καὶ φορτικὸν ὥστε νόμος ἦν μηδενὰ ποιεὶν κωμῳδιὰς ἀρεοπαγίτην. De Glor. Athen. p. 348.

Plut. de Glo. Atheniens. View, &c. p. 240.

Dennis, p. 85.

Beſides the *Latin* makes more againſt him. For by that the Law ſays, *that no Man whatſoever ſhould write any Comedys*; which is a higher Cenſure than the other. I hope for the future Mr. *Dennis* won't confide ſo much in a Tranſlation; eſpecially when it ſits harder than the *Original*.

Dennis, p. 86.

His

His Remark from *Ariſtotle*'s Treatiſe of *Poetry* is another Miſtake; and I think not at all to his Advantage: But to ſet him in his way, this Philoſopher does not ſay that *Comedy was very much diſcourag'd at firſt*, nor very little neither. This point was not argued: He only affirms, *That it was a great while before the* Chorus *was furniſh'd out by the Government.*

Ariſt. lib. de Poet. cap. 5.

I ſhould now go on with Mr. *Dennis*, and ſhew his Attempt on my other Authorities as unſucceſsful as this upon *Plutarch*; but having ſome Buſineſs at preſent, I ſhall wave it till a farther Opportunity.

One Word with the *Vindicator of the Stage*, and I have done.

This Gentleman appeared early in the Cauſe, and has given me very little trouble, and therefore 'twould hardly be Civil, not to diſpatch him at the firſt Hearing.

Vind. p. 22, 23.

He pretends I miſtake in Tranſlating *Sæcularia Spectacula*, *Stage Plays.*

To this I Anſwer, Firſt, That I only affirmed the *Stage* was manifeſtly comprehended under *Sæcularia Spectacula*: And that it is ſo, will follow from his own Aſſertion. For if the *Ludi Sæculares*, and *Sæcularia Spectacula* were the ſame, 'tis well known that *Stage Plays* were part of the *Ludi Sæculares*; all the *Theaters* being frequented at thoſe publick Solemnities.

View, &c. p. 250.

Roſin. Schott. P. 757.

Secondly, The third Council of *Carthage* by me cited, can't poſſibly mean the *Secular Plays* by *Sæcularia Spectacula*: For this Council was held *anno.* 397. fourſcore Years and better after the *Converſion* of *Conſtantine*. Now theſe

Ludi

Ludi Sæculares were Idolatrous, both in the Practice and Inſtitution, and never celebrated after the Empire became Chriſtian: The laſt time we hear of them was in the Reign of the Emperor *Philip*, *anno* 248. which was 149 years before the convening of this Council. Euſeb. in Chron.

Thirdly, *Sæculum* and *Sæcularis*, in the Language of the Fathers, relates to the unconverted *World*, in contradiſtinction to the *Church*. Thus *Typhus Sæcularis* in the Life of *Arnobius*, ſignifies Heathen Pride. And thus the Council interprets it ſelf by calling theſe *Sæcularia Spectacula*, *Pagan Entertainments*. I almoſt wonder the *Stage Vindicator* could cite the words and miſtake the Senſe. View, P. 250.

What this Author may have farther, requiring Conſideration, he may find in my Reply to Mr. *Congreve*, and the *Relapſer*, and thither I refer him.

FINIS.

Books printed for Richard Sare, *at* Grays-Inn-Gate *in* Holborn.

A Short View of the Profaneneſs and Immorality of the Engliſh Stage, A ſecond Defence of the ſhort View, *&c.* Being a Reply to a Book, Entituled, *The Ancient and Modern Stages ſurveyed*, &c.

Eſſays upon ſeveral Moral Subjects.

The Emperour *Marcus Antonius* his Converſation with himſelf. Together with the Preliminary Diſcourſe of the Learned *Gataker*. As alſo, the Emperor's Life, written by Monſieur *D'acier*, and ſupported the Authorities Collected by Dr. *Stanhope*. To which is added the Mythological Picture of *Cebes* the *Theban*. Tranſlated into Engliſh from the reſpective Originals,

All four by Mr. *Collier*.